

Diego Rodriguez
1317 Edgewater Dr.
Suite No. 5077
Orlando, FL 32804
Telephone: (208) 891-7728
Email: freedommanpress@protonmail.com

pro se

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO**

Diego Rodriguez,)	CASE NO. 1:23-cv-00212-DCN
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	MEMORANDUM IN RESPONSE TO
vs.)	EXPEDITED MOTION TO DISMISS
)	PETITION OR REMAND TO STATE
ST. LUKES HEALTH SYSTEM LTD, ST.)	COURT [DKT. 29]
LUKES REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER)	
LTD, CHRIS ROTH, NATASHA ERICKSON,)	
MD, and TRACY JUNGMAN,)	
)	
Respondents.)	
)	

COMES NOW, Petitioner Diego Rodriguez and hereby submits my Response to the
Memorandum in Response to Expedited Motion to Dismiss Petition or Remand to State Court
[Dkt. 29].

I. INTRODUCTION

Erik Stidham, attorney on behalf of respondents in this case, filed this Memorandum in a
blatant attempt to frustrate the legal process and deny me my Constitutional rights to a fair trial

in Federal Court, outside of the bias inherent in a diverse lawsuit where the parties involved are citizens of different states.

II. ARGUMENTS

Erik Stidham argues that “A Court Must Dismiss When Subject Matter Jurisdiction Is Lacking” and he argues that “There is No Diversity Jurisdiction.”

In spite of the fact that neither the Constitution nor US Code requires so called “complete diversity” where allegedly all of the defendants must be citizens of different states from all of the plaintiffs,” this lack of “complete diversity” simply does not exist since each and every one of the defendants in the state case noted are no longer a party to the case as they have all been issued default judgments against them. The only defendant left in the case is Diego Rodriguez—who is a citizen of the State of Florida.

Therefore the case in question is 5 plaintiffs with Idaho citizenship versus 1 defendant with Florida citizenship. Therefore, TOTAL DIVERSITY absolutely does exist and this case must be taken up by the Federal Court.

Even if “total diversity” did not exist, the Constitution and US Code still require the case to be taken up in Federal Court as the concept of “total diversity” is not in the Constitution nor in US Code.

III. ERIK STIDHAM’S FRIVOLOUS ARGUMENTS

Erik Stidham claimed in his memorandum that “Pursuant to District of Idaho Local Rules Civil 6.1 and 7.1(d)(1)(B), good cause exists for the Court to expedite its resolution of the Motion for Clarification and resolve the matter on the briefs without a hearing.”

Erik's arguments are frivolous because he brought no facts (nor is he qualified to), in support of this empty assertion that "good cause exists."

In actuality, Idaho Local District Civil Rules 6.1 says the court, on its own (not Erik/the respondent's attorney), would need to "show cause" to shorten the time for something. And it makes NO provision for such a request to come from the respondent's attorney. It provides for Erik to request an extension of time but not a shortening of time, and even then, Erik would need to "state the specific reason(s)" for extending the time, which he failed to do.

Also, Idaho Local District Civil Rules 7.1(d)(1)(B) says "If the presiding judge determines that oral argument will not be necessary, the matter will be decided on the briefs. If the presiding judge later determines that oral argument would be of assistance, the parties will be notified by the Court."

This has not happened. The presiding judge has not made any such determination and nobody has presented a single fact in support of such a determination. There is not a mere scintilla of admissible evidence before the court that would tend to bolster Erik's frantic desire to keep me from being heard.

Finally, Erik's memorandum is based on the false premise that he is responding to a "Petition" when in reality, I filed a "Notice of Removal" and not a "Petition to Transfer." Procedurally therefore, his memorandum is moot.

IV. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Apparently it is necessary to attach "together with a copy of all process, pleadings, and orders served upon such defendant or defendants in such action." This would be nearly impossible as this case has literally thousands of documents and pages which are readily

available online and for the public to review. However, I have attached both the Fourth Amended Complaint (Exhibit A) along with my response to the Fourth Amended Complaint (Exhibit B) so the court can review them.

DATED this 31st day of May, 2023.

By: /s/ Diego Rodriguez
Diego Rodriguez
Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the DATED this 31st day of May, 2023, I caused to be served a true and accurate copy of the foregoing document upon the following attorney(s) by the method indicated:

Erik F. Stidham HOLLAND & HART LLP 800 W. Main Street, Suite 1750 Boise, ID 83702	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage pre-paid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile (208) 954-5950 <input type="checkbox"/> iCourt: efstidham@hollandhart.com
--	--

/s/ Diego Rodriguez _____
Diego Rodriguez
Petitioner

EXHIBIT A

(Fourth Amended Complaint)

MAR 03 2023

TRENT TRIPPLE, Clerk
By DURANN PIERCE
DEPUTY

Erik F. Stidham (ISB #5483)
Jennifer M. Jensen (ISB #9275)
HOLLAND & HART LLP
800 W. Main Street, Suite 1750
Boise, ID 83702-5974
Telephone: 208.342.5000
Facsimile: 208.343.8869
E-mail: efstidham@hollandhart.com
jmjensen@hollandhart.com

Counsel for Plaintiffs

**IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE
STATE OF IDAHO, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ADA**

ST. LUKE'S HEALTH SYSTEM, LTD; ST.
LUKE'S REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER,
LTD; CHRIS ROTH, an individual;
NATASHA D. ERICKSON, MD, an
individual; and TRACY W. JUNGMAN,
NP, an individual,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

AMMON BUNDY, an individual; AMMON
BUNDY FOR GOVERNOR, a political
organization; DIEGO RODRIGUEZ, an
individual; FREEDOM MAN PRESS LLC, a
limited liability company; FREEDOM MAN
PAC, a registered political action committee;
and PEOPLE'S RIGHTS NETWORK, a
political organization and an unincorporated
association,

Defendants.

Case No. CV01-22-06789

**FOURTH AMENDED COMPLAINT AND
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

(SEALED)

St. Luke's Health System, Ltd. ("SLHS"), St. Luke's Regional Medical Center, Ltd.
("SLRMC"), Chris Roth ("Mr. Roth"), Dr. Natasha D. Erickson ("Dr. Erickson"), and Tracy W.
Jungman, NP ("NP Jungman"), collectively "St. Luke's Parties" or "Plaintiffs," by and through

their counsel, Holland & Hart, LLP, hereby bring this Complaint against Ammon Bundy (“Bundy”), Ammon Bundy for Governor (“Bundy Campaign”), Diego Rodriguez (“Rodriguez”), Freedom Man Press LLC (“FMP”), Freedom Man PAC (“FM PAC”), and the People’s Rights Network (“PRN”), collectively “Defendants,” and allege as follows:

NATURE OF THE CASE

1. Defendants engaged in a grift, recklessly exploiting the dire medical condition of an Infant to gain money and publicity for themselves. Seeking to benefit financially, to enhance their standing among their followers, and to grow the membership of and revenues from PRN, Bundy (a former candidate for Governor and founder and leader of the activist People’s Rights Network) and Rodriguez (an aspiring political and religious figure, acolyte of Bundy, and consultant and spokesperson for the Bundy Campaign) acted in concert with the other Defendants to launch a knowingly dishonest and smear campaign that claimed Idaho State employees, the judiciary, the police, primary care providers, and the St. Luke’s Parties engaged in widespread kidnapping, trafficking, sexual abuse, and killing of Idaho children.

2. In furtherance of their smear campaign, Defendants used slick marketing tactics and disinformation to launch a coordinated attack of defamation and organized business disruption against the St. Luke’s Parties. Defendants incited and agitated their followers with false conspiracy theories of the kidnapping, trafficking, sexual abuse, and killing of children purposefully creating the risk that their followers would threaten or actually commit acts of violence against the St. Luke’s Parties. Defendants made no effort to conceal their improper objectives. Indeed, they publicly declared that they wanted to subject the St. Luke’s Parties to unrelenting public shaming that would cause reputational damage and humiliation of such intensity that SLHS and SLRMC would be run out of business and Mr. Roth, CEO of SLHS, Dr. Erickson, a St. Luke’s pediatric physician, and NP Jungman, a St. Luke’s nurse practitioner,

would lose their careers and be shunned by their friends, colleagues, neighbors, spouses, and children.

3. As a premise for their wrongful actions, Defendants mischaracterized the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare's ("DHW") decision to intervene to ensure the health and safety of Rodriguez's infant relative ("Infant"). Bundy, Rodriguez, and the other Defendants falsely claimed that DHW's intervention was wholly without basis and was an example of the widespread government conspiracy of kidnapping, trafficking, sexual abuse, and killing of children for financial gain.

4. Defendants falsely stated that the St. Luke's Parties were participants in this nefarious organized ring and had participated in the kidnapping and mistreatment of the Infant. Among other things, Defendants falsely stated that (1) the St. Luke's Parties initiated and caused the State's intervention relating to the Infant, (2) the Infant had no need for medical care from the St. Luke's Parties, (3) the St. Luke's Parties provided unnecessary and improper medical treatment to drive up medical bills for the Infant's parents, (4) the St. Luke's Parties harmed the Infant, (5) the St. Luke's Parties had the authority to release the Infant but were illegally refusing to do so, and (6) that St. Luke's was conspiring with Idaho Governor Brad Little (Bundy's political opponent) in targeting the Infant. The Defendants made these false statements and others relating to the St. Luke's Parties while knowing the statements to be without factual basis or recklessly disregarding the truth.

5. Bundy and Rodriguez coordinated the wrongful attacks to further a number of improper objectives, including (1) to harm the St. Luke's Parties, (2) to subvert the authority and rulings of the judiciary through harassment, (3) to mislead and manipulate their followers, (4) to enhance their political reputations and personal brands, (5) to grow membership in the PRN,

(6) to drive traffic to Defendants' websites, (7) to benefit themselves financially through financial contributions, donations, and fees paid to the Bundy Campaign, Rodriguez's political action committee (FM PAC), the PRN, a supposed charity benefitting Rodriguez's family, Bundy's entities Dono Custos, Inc. and Abish-husbondi, Inc., and Rodriguez's entity Freedom Tabernacle Incorporated and Power Marketing Agency, LLC and Power Marketing Consultants LLC .

6. The St. Luke's Parties bring this lawsuit to protect patients and staff from further harm, defamation, harassment, and threats of violence and to ensure that political bullying and Defendants' grift do not prevent St. Luke's from furthering its mission to improve the health of people in the communities it serves.

PARTIES, VENUE, AND JURISDICTION

7. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff SLHS was and is a not-for-profit corporation doing business in Idaho with its principal places of business in Ada County, Idaho.

8. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff SLRMC was and is a not-for-profit corporation doing business in Idaho with its principal places of business in Ada County, Idaho.

9. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff Mr. Roth was and is President and CEO of SLHS and a resident of Idaho.

10. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff Dr. Erickson was and is a physician specializing in pediatric medicine. She is an employee of SLRMC and a resident of Idaho.

11. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff NP Jungman was and is a nurse practitioner specializing in pediatrics. She is an employee of SLRMC and a resident of Idaho.

12. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant Ammon Bundy was and is a resident of Idaho. Bundy controls the Bundy Campaign and is the founder and leader of the PRN. Through his control of the PRN, Bundy effectively controls PRN's website, peoplesrights.org. Bundy

generates money for his use and benefit by marketing himself as an anti-government, quasi-religious leader.

13. Bundy owns and controls or owned and controlled at least two corporate entities (Dono Custos, Inc. and Abish-husbandi. Inc.) through which he generates revenues for himself from his campaign and leadership of PRN. Dono Custos receives money directly from members of PRN. Revenues received by Dono Custos are used to benefit Bundy. Abish-husbandi received payments directly from the Bundy Campaign and those payments benefited Bundy personally. The potential revenue to Bundy is significant. If each member of PRN annually contributes just \$50 to Bundy through Dono Custos, Bundy could pocket more than \$3,000,000 per year. Bundy directed tens of thousands of dollars contributed to the Bundy Campaign to Abish-husbandi.

14. On information and belief, the corporate personalities of Dono Custos and Abish-husbandi and Bundy are indistinguishable; Bundy exerts complete control over the entities and all decision making by the entities such that the entities operate as alter-egos of Bundy. On information and belief, Abish-husbandi and Dono Custos do not operate separately from Bundy, do not follow corporate formalities, and do not keep separate books.

15. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant Bundy Campaign was and is an Idaho political organization formed for the ostensible purpose of raising money to support Bundy's effort to become Governor of Idaho. Aaron Welling was the treasurer for the Bundy Campaign. Welling resigned in late spring 2022. After Welling's resignation, Bundy took over and became treasurer. Monies received by the Bundy Campaign were distributed to entities owned by Bundy and entities owned by Rodriguez.

16. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant Rodriguez was a resident of Idaho. Rodriguez promotes himself as a world-renowned marketing consultant, motivational speaker,

religious leader, author, and political activist. Rodriguez is a leader in the PRN, serves or served as a consultant to and spokesperson for the Bundy Campaign, controls the FMP and the FM PAC, and writes political attack columns for FMP under the alias “Gunner Steele.” Rodriguez is financially entangled with the other Defendants and seeks to benefit from the false conspiracy he manufactured. Rodriguez is the founder of Freedom Tabernacle Incorporated which purports to be a church but is used as an entity to receive contributions, dues, or payments from members of PRN. Also, Rodriguez is financially motivated to grow Freedom Tabernacle as he mandates members “tithes” 10% of their earnings. Rodriguez benefits from monies received by the Freedom Tabernacle and the growth of PRN. Rodriguez receives money from the Bundy Campaign through at least one of his business entities, Power Marketing. Rodriguez uses his enhanced profile and the manufactured conspiracy relating to the Infant to sell three-day “training” courses through Power Marketing for which he charges \$15,000 per “student.”

17. On information and belief, the corporate personalities of Freedom Tabernacle Incorporated, Power Marketing Agency, LLC, and Power Marketing Consultants, LLC are indistinguishable from Rodriguez; Rodriguez exerts complete control over the entities and all decision making by the entities such that the entities operate as alter-egos of Rodriguez. On information and belief, Freedom Tabernacle, Power Marketing Agency, and Power Marketing Consultants do not operate separately from Rodriguez, do not follow corporate formalities, and do not keep separate books. To the extent the corporate entities have other individuals involved, they are the family members controlled by Rodriguez. Freedom Tabernacle, Power Marketing Agency, and Power Marketing Consultants are alter-egos of Rodriguez.

18. At all times relevant hereto, and based on information on freedomman.org, Defendant FMP held itself out as a limited liability company which owns and controls

freedomman.org, a website that specializes in political attacks and disinformation and advocates for the harassment of political opponents through “doxing.” FMP is not registered as an LLC in Idaho or registered to do business in Idaho. FMP, its website, and all content on the FMP website are controlled by Rodriguez.

19. At all times relevant hereto, FM PAC is and was an Idaho registered political action committee formed by and controlled by Rodriguez. FM PAC works in coordination with FMP and is promoted on freedomman.org.

20. Founded and controlled by Bundy, Defendant PRN is an unincorporated association of over 60,000 members. Like Bundy, PRN does not recognize the government’s authority over a person’s “life, liberty, or justly acquired property”; rather, PRN operates based on Bundy’s teachings that PRN members are divinely ordained to adjudicate supposed violations of “rights” and punish extrajudicially the “wicked” person, through harassment, doxing, or the use of force. PRN owns and operates the peoplesrights.org website. PRN markets itself as a network designed to defeat “government criminals” who seek to take away rights and freedoms. In truth, PRN is an unincorporated association controlled by Bundy which acts extra-judicially and uses doxing, harassment, economic disruption, and threats of violence to harass political enemies and to enhance Bundy’s personal power. At all times relevant hereto, PRN is controlled through Bundy’s operations in Emmett, Idaho. Rodriguez is actively involved in PRN. Defendants actively market and promote PRN with the objective of increasing the payments that members of PRN make to the entities Bundy and Rodriguez control, including Dono Custos and Freedom Tabernacle.

21. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to Idaho Code § 1-705 and personal jurisdiction over the Defendants pursuant to Idaho Code § 5-514.

22. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to Idaho Code §§ 5-401 and 5-404.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

Role of the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare in Child Welfare

23. Idaho's laws regarding child safety are primarily administered and implemented by DHW.

24. Idaho law imposes mandatory reporting requirements on Idaho residents to report concerns about a child's safety.

25. When a report is filed regarding child safety, DHW assesses the severity of the case. In high-danger cases, a social worker and possibly police visit the family to check on the child. Based on the visit and in consultation with the social or healthcare workers, police decide whether to declare the child in imminent danger. If the child is in imminent danger, police may place the child in temporary custody with DHW until a hearing can be held.

The Role of St. Luke's in Child Health

26. SLHS is the only Idaho-based not-for-profit health care system. SLRMC, a wholly owned subsidiary of SLHS, operates hospitals in Boise ("St. Luke's Boise") and Meridian ("St. Luke's Meridian"). SLHS and SLRMC share the same mission: to improve the health of people in the communities they serve.

27. The St. Luke's Parties are subject to State and Federal law. If a child is determined to be in imminent danger because of health issues and is transported to a St. Luke's hospital, the St. Luke's Parties will care for the child. However, SLHS and SLRMC are not agents of DHW or any other State of Idaho department. Mr. Roth is an employee of SLHS, and Dr. Erickson and NP Jungman are employees of SLRMC. They take no direction from DHW or any other State department.

St. Luke's Care for the Infant

28. On March 1, 2022, the parents took the Infant to the St. Luke's Boise emergency room (ER) because the Infant had reportedly been vomiting for weeks and had lost a significant amount of weight.

29. A St. Luke's ER provider treated the Infant for dehydration. Then, in consultation with the on-call pediatric specialist, Plaintiff Dr. Natasha Erickson, the ER provider admitted the Infant. The parents agreed to admission.

30. Upon admission, St. Luke's began to treat the Infant with IV fluids because the Infant would not breastfeed or bottle feed. On March 2, 2022, a St. Luke's dietician diagnosed the Infant with chronic severe malnutrition because, among other things, the Infant's weight was well below the first percentile and the Infant showed signs of moderate fat and muscle wasting. Due to this severe, life-threatening malnutrition, the dietician and Dr. Erickson agreed on a plan to feed the Infant via a nasal tube.

31. The Infant continued to struggle with oral feeding. Nevertheless, the parents repeatedly sought to take the Infant home early despite the risk to the Infant.

32. On March 3, 2022, Dr. Erickson met with the Infant's parents, and explained that the Infant needed to remain hospitalized to work on feeding and weight gain, and that, given the Infant's condition, she would need to contact child welfare if the parents chose to take the Infant home against medical advice. The parents agreed to let the Infant stay at St. Luke's for another day.

33. On March 4, 2022, the Infant's oral feeding began to improve. Although Dr. Erickson recommended another night in the hospital, the Infant's parents decided to take the Infant home. Dr. Erickson agreed to discharge the Infant at the parent's request with a nasal tube in place so the parents could feed the Infant if oral feeding dropped off. Dr. Erickson explained

that the Infant would need continued nasal feeds and frequent follow-up monitoring by the Infant's primary care physician after discharge.

34. The parents were with the Infant throughout the Infant's hospitalization. They consented to all care at St. Luke's Boise Medical Center.

35. Neither Dr. Erickson nor any St. Luke's employee-initiated contact with child welfare or any other division of DHW regarding the Infant's hospitalization.

The Infant's Parents Fail to Attend Follow-Up Appointments

36. Following discharge, St. Luke's tried to arrange a visit at the Infant's home on March 5 and March 6, 2022. However, the Infant's parents did not return their phone calls.

37. On March 7, 2022, the Infant's parents attended a follow-up appointment with the Infant's new primary care provider (PCP), who is not affiliated with St. Luke's. The appointment revealed the Infant had lost weight since being discharged from St. Luke's and that the nasal tube was no longer in place. A follow up appointment was scheduled for March 10, 2022.

38. The parents attended the March 10, 2022, appointment. Again, the appointment revealed the Infant had lost weight. The PCP asked the Infant's parents to bring the Infant back for a weight check on March 11, 2022.

39. The Infant's parents failed to bring the Infant to the scheduled weight check on the morning of March 11, 2022. When the family failed to appear for the weight check, the Infant's PCP referred the situation to DHW.

40. After hearing from the PCP, DHW determined that the Infant was in immediate danger involving a life threatening and/or emergency situation. DHW notified the Meridian

Police Department in accordance with DHW's standard practice. The Meridian PD began trying to locate the Infant.

41. Later on March 11, 2022, DHW reached out to NP Jungman, a nurse practitioner at St. Luke's CARES (Children at Risk Evaluation Services). The DHW safety assessor asked NP Jungman for a consult on the Infant's Priority I referral. NP Jungman reviewed the medical records from the Infant's initial admission, the Priority I referral, and the additional information provided from DHW, and advised DHW and the Meridian PD that the Infant be brought in for evaluation on March 11, 2022. She told DHW and the Meridian PD that if the family wanted to bring the Infant to St. Luke's CARES voluntarily, she would stay late that afternoon to save the family another visit to the ER. NP Jungman did not medically diagnose the Infant.

42. The Meridian PD continued to try and get a response from the parents and tried to locate the Infant.

43. That afternoon, DHW spoke by phone to the Infant's father, who said that the Infant and the Infant's mother were sleeping, but that they would come to CARES when they woke up. Despite the representation from the Infant's father, the Infant was not brought to CARES.

Police Take Custody of the Infant

44. Later on March 11, 2022, Meridian police went to the family's residence to check on the Infant's safety. The family refused to cooperate, provide information, or let the officers see the Infant, forcing the police to get a warrant.

45. Defendant Rodriguez stated he was present when the police visited the residence and was aware, at least by the time of the visit, that the police were looking for the Infant out of concern for the Infant's health.

46. Rodriguez took no steps to assist the police in obtaining information regarding the Infant.

47. When the police left the house to get a warrant, the Infant and the Infant's parents moved to another location.

48. Believing the Infant was at risk of imminent harm due to the Infant's recent severe malnutrition, the parents' failure to follow medical advice, and the family's refusal to provide the police with information, the Meridian PD alerted its officers that the Infant was in danger and instructed them to look for the parents' vehicle.

49. The police located the Infant and the Infant's parents late on the night of March 11, 2022, in Garden City. When the Infant's parents refused to cooperate, the police took custody of the Infant and transported the Infant to St. Luke's Meridian in an ambulance.

50. At the time the Infant was taken into custody, the parents were informed that there would be a court hearing within 48 hours and that the ultimate objectives were to assure the safety of the Infant and keep the family unit intact.

51. The St. Luke's Parties had no authority regarding, did not participate in, and played no role regarding how the Infant was taken into custody.

The Infant Recovers at St. Luke's Boise

52. In the early hours of Saturday, March 12, 2022, providers at St. Luke's Meridian evaluated the Infant and quickly decided to transfer the Infant to the pediatric floor of the St. Luke's Boise Medical Center for specialized care.

53. When the ten-month-old Infant was admitted to St. Luke's in Boise for a second time, the Infant weighed a mere thirteen pounds and fourteen ounces. The Infant had lost more than half of a pound since being discharged eight days earlier. The Infant's feeding tube —

which was in place when St. Luke's discharged the Infant on March 4th — was no longer in place. The Infant's lips were cracked and dry. The Infant's ribs and spine were showing. The Infant had low blood sugar and kidney and liver dysfunction consistent with acute dehydration. The Infant's health had dramatically worsened under the parents' care from March 4 to March 11, 2022.

54. Once again, St. Luke's cared for the Infant through nasal feeding and rehydration. The Infant's health improved. The Infant began to gain weight.

55. St. Luke's providers gave the Infant's parents detailed updates on the Infant's condition and plan of care. But despite the Infant's concerning condition, the parents refused to provide medical information, including birth records, newborn screening, and prior medical records. The Infant's parents stated that they were withholding the medical information on advice from their attorney.

56. St. Luke's updated the Infant's parents on the Infant's status throughout the Infant's treatment. The Infant's parents consented to the Infant's treatment plan.

57. Contrary to Defendants' statements, St. Luke's did not vaccinate the Infant against the wishes of the parents. The St. Luke's Parties did not "harm [the Infant] in irreparable ways." Nor did they "abuse" the Infant. As explained below, such statements were false and were intended to attract media attention, incite followers, collect donations, disrupt hospital operations, and defame the St. Luke's Parties.

The Infant is Discharged and Returned to His Family

58. Once again, the Infant's condition improved significantly under the care of the St. Luke's team. On March 15, 2022, St. Luke's discharged the Infant as the Infant was medically stable, gaining weight, tolerating oral feeding, and healthy enough for outpatient care.

St. Luke's decision to discharge the Infant was purely based on the Infant's medical condition, not the ongoing protests, pressure, or threats from Defendants or their followers discussed below.

59. The court proceedings relating to the Infant are confidential.

60. St. Luke's discharged the Infant to DHW, which in turn released the Infant to his parents on March 18, 2022.

Defendants Create a False Narrative

61. As alleged above, St. Luke's doctors treated the Infant's severe, life-threatening malnutrition and dehydration. The Infant was returned to the parents. DHW acted to ensure the safety of the Infant and pursued the goal of returning the Infant to the parents. The confidential court proceedings provided for by statute occurred.

62. Nevertheless, Bundy, Rodriguez, and the other Defendants chose to exploit the events surrounding DHS's intervention and the Infant's care to enhance their standing and to profit financially.

63. Defendants' prestige, political influence, personal brands, "business," and revenue all depend on Defendants' ability to market themselves as leaders in the fight against governmental overreach. The size of the membership of PRN, and, in turn, the amount of revenues flowing to the Bundy Campaign, Bundy's Dono Custos and Abish-husbondi entities, and Rodriguez's Freedom Tabernacle all depend on Defendants' efforts to market themselves as champions fighting against government conspiracies. Likewise, the more Rodriguez is able to raise his profile among his target market, the better chance he has to sell his followers services through Power Marketing.

64. Defendants perceived the events surrounding DHW's intervention as an opportunity to spread their lies and further their agendas. They realized that the facts

surrounding DHW's intervention could be mischaracterized as a governmental conspiracy to kidnap, traffic, and kill children. Then, in turn, Defendants realized they could establish themselves as crusaders against their falsely manufactured governmental conspiracy.

65. To that end, Defendants worked together to manufacture a false narrative of a state-sponsored child kidnapping and trafficking ring that included DHW, the police, the Idaho Judiciary, the Governor of Idaho, the Infant's PCP, and the St. Luke's Parties.

66. In support of their wrongful objectives, Defendants defamed the supposed members of the kidnapping and child trafficking ring and then incited their followers by stating that countless children, like the Infant, would be kidnapped, trafficked, and potentially killed unless immediate action was taken to destroy the St. Luke's Parties and others.

67. Defendants acted in concert to disseminate this false narrative. Evidence indicates that Bundy, Rodriguez, and the other Defendants coordinated talking points and the timing of demonstrations and provided the same directions to followers regarding how to disrupt the St. Luke's Parties. They told their followers to target the same individuals for doxing and harassment. Defendants mirrored false statements across the websites and social media they controlled.

68. Defendants operated as a single enterprise to defame and harm the St. Luke's Parties and others.

Defendants Knowingly Harmed the St. Luke's Parties

69. Defendants were aware of the likely impact of their joint actions. When they developed their plan, Bundy, Rodriguez, and the other Defendants knew that spreading their false claims would result in damage to the St. Luke's Parties, including death threats, business interruption, trespass, reputational damage, menacing crowds, and potentially mob violence.

70. Despite foreseeing the consequences, Bundy, Rodriguez, and the other Defendants acted to maximize harm and damage. As Rodriguez bragged publicly, Defendants wanted to harass and shame the St. Luke's Parties with claims of child kidnapping and murder such that St. Luke's employees would be shunned by their families and lose their careers, while St. Luke's itself would be run out of business. Bundy, Rodriguez, PRN and the other Defendants intended or acted recklessly to enflame followers so there would be violence or, at least a real threat of violence against the St. Luke's Parties.

71. Bundy, Rodriguez, and the other Defendants knew that a legal process existed to address the custody and welfare of the Infant. Bundy and Rodriguez were involved in and kept informed of all legal proceedings relating to the Infant.

72. Defendants knew their harassment and threats of violence they generated would not deter those targeted from doing what was best for the Infant. They knew that the judge would not be cowed into changing how she would rule in the case. They knew that DHW would not act contrary to what it believed was in the best interest of the Infant. They knew the St. Luke's Parties would not discharge the Infant until the Infant was medically ready for discharge. And they knew the St. Luke's Parties did not have the authority to determine whether the Infant would be discharged home or to a foster family.

73. Despite knowing that DHW, the trial court, and the St. Luke's Parties would not be threatened into abandoning the law or the Infant's best interests, Defendants engaged in their coordinated false statements and wrongful acts. Defendants did so because their wrongful acts were motivated by other goals.

74. The facts and circumstances indicate that Defendants' motives in creating and disseminating the false kidnapping and child trafficking narrative included, but are not limited to

the following goals: (1) generating support for the Bundy Campaign; (2) raising and monetizing the political profiles and personal brands of Bundy and Rodriguez, especially within the People's Rights Network and other political groups; (3) driving web traffic to sites controlled by Defendants; (4) solidifying control over their followers; (5) creating financial gain in the form of payments to and donations to Bundy's campaign, PRN, Rodriguez's PAC, and a fund that was established for Rodriguez's family; (6) generating more revenue for Rodriguez's Power Marketing entities and his Freedom Tabernacle Incorporated; and (7) generating more money for Bundy's entities, including Dono Custos and Abish-husbondi.

False Narrative Regarding DHW's Intervention

75. Understanding the need to create a narrative that served a larger conspiracy theory, Rodriguez misrepresented the circumstances that led to DHW's intervention regarding the Infant. Among other things, Rodriguez, with assistance from the other Defendants, falsely asserted that the Infant was not at risk and had a "100% clean bill of health" when taken into custody, that the parents had only missed a single medical appointment, and that Dr. Erickson had reported the parents and the Infant to DHW.

76. In truth, Rodriguez knew or should have known that the Infant was not well and faced significant health risks. Rodriguez knew the parents had failed to follow several steps needed to ensure the Infant was receiving needed medical care and failed to respond to those properly seeking information regarding the health of the Infant. Rodriguez further understood that he had no factual basis to assert that Dr. Erickson had contacted DHW. Dr. Erickson never contacted DHW regarding the Infant.

Bundy Trespasses at St. Luke's Meridian to Generate Publicity and Contributions

77. Bundy has a history of forcing confrontation with police to generate publicity for himself and his political agenda and in order to make money for himself.

78. Shortly after the police took the Infant into custody, Bundy was made aware and took action to garner publicity and, in turn, make money for himself.

79. When Bundy learned that police had transported the Infant to St. Luke's in Meridian, Bundy and a group of his followers travelled to the hospital for the purpose of initiating a conflict with the police and potentially getting arrested. He knew that by orchestrating a protest and arrest at the hospital that he would win media attention, enhance his brand, and likely generate financial contributions for himself and the Bundy Campaign.

80. On Saturday, March 12, 2022, at around 1:30 a.m., Bundy and his followers entered the ambulance bay at St. Luke's in Meridian—a primary access point for medical emergencies. Once there, the group yelled and cursed at hospital staff and uniformed police officers. As Bundy planned, his followers were prepared with their cameras and immediately shared the confrontation Bundy manufactured on social media.

81. St. Luke's security guards recognized Bundy, based on his actions and direction of the crowd, as “the catalyst and aggressor in the group.”

82. Hospital staff explained to Bundy and his followers that the group was blocking emergency access to the ambulance bay and asked them to move to a nearby area where they would not block patient access. Following Bundy's lead, the group refused to move and continued to harass hospital staff.

83. Hospital staff told Bundy and his followers that they would be trespassing if they stayed in the ambulance bay. Once again, the group refused to leave.

84. Recognizing that Bundy's followers were growing more numerous and menacing, a hospital supervisor tried to reason with Bundy and deescalate the situation. For the benefit of those there to film him, Bundy responded by accusing the supervisor of kidnapping and then demanded that he give Bundy the Infant. Bundy knew full well he had no legal authority to make that demand because he had no parental rights over the Infant and because the Infant had been taken into protective custody pursuant to Idaho law.

85. Bundy knew that St. Luke's would not and could not as a matter of law release the Infant into Bundy's custody.

86. Hospital staff repeatedly warned Bundy and his followers to clear the ambulance bay. Bundy heard and refused to heed the warnings on at least three occasions.

87. Bundy knew the police had no option but to arrest him for trespass. As Bundy intended, the police arrested him just before 2:00 a.m. on March 12, 2022. Bundy was on the way to getting the publicity he craved.

88. Bundy's followers recorded his arrest for social media and then dispersed.

89. The police released Bundy a few hours after his trespass.

90. Upon his release, Bundy immediately began to publicize his arrest. In accordance with the messaging campaign developed by Rodriguez (a paid marketing consultant for the Bundy Campaign), Bundy mischaracterized the Infant as having been in good health, falsely stated the Infant had been kidnapped from his parents because a single appointment was missed, indicated the Infant's health was at risk in the hospital, falsely stated that he had been arrested for trespass without warning and justification, and directed his followers to the freedomman.org website which already contained messaging supporting the false kidnapping and child trafficking narrative.

91. Shortly thereafter, the Bundy Campaign and PRN likewise began to publish the same false narrative regarding the Infant's care at St. Luke's and regarding Bundy's arrest at St. Luke's in Meridian.

Concerted Effort to Disrupt St. Luke's Business

92. To further their false narrative, Defendants made false statements regarding the Infants' care and repeatedly defamed the St. Luke's Parties. In addition, Defendants repeatedly told their followers that the St. Luke's Parties need to be punished and directed their followers on how to shame the St. Luke's Parties and disrupt St. Luke's operations. Defendants intended to incite or acted recklessly to incite followers and the public to threaten violence and to commit violence against the St. Luke's Parties. In particular, Bundy knew he had cultivated a personal following that was conditioned to see him as a leader and quasi-religious figure and that his participation in and endorsement of this false narrative would inspire threats of violence and likely real violence against the St. Luke's Parties by his followers.

93. Defendants incited their followers by publishing patently untrue statements and providing direction to cause harm, including falsely stating the following:

- a. St. Luke's Parties were participating in a conspiracy to kidnap, traffic, sexually abuse, and kill children;
- b. St. Luke's Parties were running a child trafficking ring in order to profit from tax dollars;
- c. St. Luke's Parties were abusing and harming the Infant in irreparable ways;
- d. St. Luke's Parties harmed and killed babies all the time;
- e. St. Luke's Parties kidnapped the Infant and other children;
- f. St. Luke's Parties were "moronic imbeciles" who neglected the Infant;
- g. St. Luke's Parties stole the Infant;

- h. St. Luke's changed the Infant into someone who was unrecognizable, lethargic, and unresponsive;
- i. St. Luke's failed to keep the Infant clean;
- j. St. Luke's caused the Infant "suspicious" bruising;
- k. St. Luke's lied about the Infant's treatment;
- l. St. Luke's Parties vaccinated the Infant against the family's wishes;
- m. St. Luke's Parties were "medically negligent";
- n. St. Luke's was "world famous" for "mistreating people," "killing people," and "stealing babies from their parents";
- o. St. Luke's forced the Infant to take "toxic poison" which was then allowed to stay in the Infant's body for days;
- p. St. Luke's Parties changed and falsified information in the medical records to protect themselves;
- q. Mr. Roth was guilty of criminal accessory of child abduction and deprivation of rights under color of law;
- r. Mr. Roth personally profited from the pandemic;
- s. Dr. Erickson was responsible for the Infant's kidnapping;
- t. Dr. Erickson participated in kidnapping "hundreds of children" with the help of a judge;
- u. The Infant "possibly could lose his life because of the decisions of people [at St. Luke's] who don't even care" about the Infant;
- v. The hospital made the Infant "more sickly";
- w. Followers should put "physical pressure" on those "that are causing the problem";
- x. Followers should disrupt St. Luke's operations by protesting, calling in, donating money, making noise, and giving the hospital "hell";
- y. God should "crush the necks of those that are evil."

94. Defendants caused disruption to St. Luke's operations, harmed staff and patients, and impaired patient care inside the hospital.

95. Between March 12 and March 17, 2022, Defendants Bundy, Rodriguez, PRN and the other Defendants called on their followers to protest at St. Luke's in Boise, to demand the return of the Infant, and to prevent transfer of the Infant from the hospital into foster care. In response, crowds, many of whom carried firearms, began to join Bundy and Rodriguez at the hospital in a concerted effort to disrupt the hospital's operations and intimidate hospital staff and patients.

96. Rodriguez became a daily presence at the hospital. Rodriguez conducted defamatory "press conferences" outside the St. Luke's Boise hospital.

97. Incited by Defendants, the crowd of followers harassed patients and staff, and disrupted patient care. Patients reported feeling anxious and fearful because of Defendants' noisy and menacing protests.

98. On March 15, 2022, Defendants went so far as to cause St. Luke's to go into lockdown for more than an hour. During this time, nurses, doctors, and other employees could not enter or exit the building. St. Luke's directed patients to other facilities and rerouted ambulances to other sites.

99. Defendants also organized a campaign of technological disruption. They encouraged their followers to flood St. Luke's phone lines and email inboxes in an effort to shut down St. Luke's operations. Defendants' followers jammed phone lines with menacing calls (including death threats), sent threatening emails, and sent spam emails to disrupt servers. Using his notoriety, Bundy repeatedly directed his followers to disrupt St. Luke's operations.

Solicitations for Donations to Rodriguez's Family

100. Concurrently while acting to harm the St. Luke's Parties, Rodriguez, with help from the other Defendants, solicited money based on false representations relating to the Infant,

the circumstances leading to DHW's intervention, the parents' financial condition, and the St. Luke's Parties.

101. A center piece in almost every one of Rodriguez's media appearances was a solicitation for donations to his family members, the parents of the Infant. Likewise, the solicitation for donations was advertised on peoplesrights.org and freedomman.org.

102. These solicitations for charitable contributions were made based on the defamatory statements about the St. Luke's Parties and others kidnapping, trafficking, and killing children.

103. The solicitations were also premised on false statements regarding the parents' liability for the medical care provided by SLHS, SLRMC, and Dr. Erickson. Rodriguez repeatedly stated that the St. Luke's Parties were performing unnecessary medical tests and treatments on the Infant, unnecessarily extending the Infant's time at the hospital to increase costs, and extorting the Infant's parents. These statements were false.

104. As Rodriguez knew or recklessly failed to learn, the parents did not have significant financial liability relating to the Infant's care. While the Infant's serious medical condition did require significant care and the parents were uninsured, governmental assistance and St. Luke's policies alleviated any significant financial burden.

105. While the Infant was receiving care, the Infant's parents were made aware that significant costs were being covered by government assistance. St. Luke's also took steps to assist the parents in minimizing the financial impact of the healthcare provided to the Infant. For example, when the Infant's parents expressed concerns about paying for the hospital stay during the Infant's first admission, a St. Luke's employee screened the family and informed them that they likely qualified for Medicaid assistance.

106. A patient care coordinator passed their concerns along to a patient financial advocate (PFA), and the PFA spoke with the Infant's mother on March 2, 2022, to discuss financial assistance options. The PFA screened the family for Medicaid and advised the Infant's mother that, given their reported family income, the Infant qualified for Children's Health Insurance Plan (CHIP) under Medicaid. The employee later tried to call the Infant's parents on March 3, 2022, and March 8, 2022, to offer further assistance, but the parents did not answer or return the calls.

107. Medicaid covered the Infant's medical bills for both ER visits and admissions. Despite absence of insurance, the Infant's family does not have any outstanding balance due to St. Luke's. The Infant's family never paid anything for and owe nothing for the care the Infant received at St. Luke's, including the care received during the hospital stay March 1-4, 2022 which was initiated by the Infant's parents.

108. Despite knowing that the Infant's parents had not incurred significant liability for the medical care received at SLRMC, Rodriguez, assisted by the other Defendants, continued to solicit donations, and received more than \$115,000 based on misrepresentations that the St. Luke's Parties had engaged in wrongdoing and that St. Luke's had created huge financial liability for Rodriguez's family.

Defendants Used the False Narrative to Market PRN and Other Business Ventures

109. Defendants used their false narrative regarding the Infant to market PRN.

110. Defendants repeatedly misrepresented that the Infant was released to the Infant's parents based on the fact that PRN had acted to disrupt the operations of the St. Luke's Parties and acted to intimidate and threaten the St. Luke's Parties.

111. Defendants made these false statements knowing that the Infant was released in accordance with the judicial proceedings, because St. Luke's was able to stabilize the Infant's medical condition, and because protections were put in place to protect the Infant's health going forward.

112. Defendants knew that PRN and the other Defendants did not assist with or accelerate the release of the Infant to the parents. Defendants knew that their actions had actually slowed and complicated the process of returning the Infant to the parents. Nevertheless, Bundy and Rodriguez and the other Defendants committed to selling the false narrative to grow membership in PRN and to make money off members who were directed to make payments to Rodriguez's Freedom Tabernacle entity and/or Bundy's Dono Custos entity.

113. In fact, even after the Infant was returned to the Infant's parents, Rodriguez and Bundy have continued to exploit the Infant by incessantly marketing the Infant and his likeness through social media and alternative media to promote PRN, Bundy in campaign advertising, and Rodriguez and his multiplicity of sales schemes.

Defendants Continue to Defame and Call for Harassment

114. Defendants' efforts to disrupt and dismantle St. Luke's and defame Plaintiffs did not stop when the Infant was discharged.

115. Seeking to continue to benefit politically and financially from the false conspiracy Defendants manufactured, Rodriguez recently created the group "People Against Child Trafficking."

116. On March 26, 2022, Bundy and Rodriguez organized a rally on property owned by one of Bundy's companies.

117. The rally was heavily advertised by Defendants and was exploited as a fundraising event by the Bundy Campaign.

118. During the March 26, 2022, rally, Defendants continued to make false, defamatory statements about the St. Luke's parties, including the following:

- a. Defendant Rodriguez stated Dr. Erickson kept the Infant in the hospital to "rack[] up the bill" while displaying defamatory images of Dr. Erickson on a large movie screen;
- b. Defendant Rodriguez stated the St. Luke's Parties engaged in kidnapping and child trafficking for money;
- c. Defendant Rodriguez indicated that the St. Luke's Parties were taking part in the "greatest child trafficking ring in the history of the world"; and
- d. Defendant Bundy described the St. Luke's Parties as equivalent to rapists, comparing the St. Luke's Parties to "feudal lords" practicing "primae noctis";¹

119. At the March 26, 2022, rally on the Bundy Property, Rodriguez bragged about shutting down St. Luke's phones system such that St. Luke's "couldn't even operate."

120. At the March 26, 2022, rally, Defendants used defamatory speech to incite people to join PRN and to take the fight against the St. Luke's Parties and other supposed kidnappers and child traffickers "all the way to the end."

121. The defamatory statements made at the March 26, 2022, rally were streamed and the video was later posted to social media sites and to websites controlled by Defendants.

122. Defendants continue to defame the St. Luke's Parties, including but not limited to publishing or making the following false, misleading, and defamatory statements.

¹ Primae Noctis names an ancient tradition in which all noble lords had the right to have sex with any female subject, regardless of her will, and even with a virgin bride on her wedding night. <https://www.dictionary.com/e/historical-current-events/prima-nocta/#:~:text=Prima%20nocta%20is%20the%20semi,particularly%20on%20her%20wedding%20night.>

123. Defendant Bundy falsely and publicly reaffirmed that all of his prior public statements about Plaintiffs were true.

124. Defendant Bundy falsely and publicly accused St. Luke's of taking the Infant.

125. Defendant Bundy falsely and publicly accused St. Luke's of taking other peoples' children.

126. Defendant Rodriguez falsely and publicly accused St. Luke's of being involved in a child trafficking network and kidnapping children.

127. Defendant Rodriguez falsely and publicly accused St. Luke's of profiting off of the false kidnapping of the Infant.

128. Defendant Rodriguez falsely stated in emails in support of a web site he is creating that St. Luke's is corrupt and wicked and is involved in extortion harming Idahoans every day.

129. Defendant Rodriguez falsely stated on a website of his creation that St. Luke's and its CEO Mr. Roth are corrupt, wicked, and commit extortion every day.

130. Defendant Rodriguez, Bundy, and PRN have repeatedly made the false statements that Plaintiffs participated in a conspiracy with DHW and Governor Little to kidnap and traffic the Infant in retaliation for Bundy's political opposition to government actions taken to mitigate the COVID-19 pandemic.

131. In a video that he produced and promoted widely on the internet on or about February 10, 2023, Bundy falsely stated that Dr. Erickson misdiagnosed the Infant and called CPS.

132. In a video that he produced and promoted widely on the internet on or about February 10, 2023, Bundy falsely stated that Chris Roth was an accessory to child abduction.

133. In a news article published in the Idaho Press on or about February 10, 2023, Bundy falsely stated that Dr. Erickson misdiagnosed the Infant.

134. In an interview on or about January 27, 2023, which was posted and promoted on the internet, Bundy falsely stated that St. Luke's misdiagnosed the Infant multiple times, three times while in the hospital's care.

135. On or about January 17, 2023, Bundy published "Come No More Upon Me, A Warning Letter from Ammon Bundy" ("Come No More Threat") on the PRN website and on other websites which contains a number of false statements, including, but not limited to, false statements that: (1) the Infant was taken into protective custody as part of a conspiracy involving St. Luke's and government officials which targeted Bundy; and (2) that he was forced to sell his home because St. Luke's put a lien on the property.

136. Further, Bundy and PRN updated the "Come No More Threat" numerous times between January 17, 2023 and February 10, 2023 to make additional threats and false statements, including, but not limited to: (1) that "the Senior Executives at St. Luke's are getting away with committing horrible crimes against children in Idaho . . ."; and (2) that St. Luke's negotiated with him regarding his criminal trespass.

137. Defendant Bundy made numerous false public statements that the Infant was neglected while in St. Luke's care. Among other places, Bundy made these false statements on or around February 9, 2023 on the internet video blog entitled "The Pete Santilli Show".

138. Defendant Rodriguez has repeatedly used hate speech directed at the LGBTQ+ community while making false statements in widely disseminated interviews that St. Luke's participates in a conspiracy to kidnap babies from Godly, Christian families in order to traffic the babies to "homos" who are likely to abuse or kill the stolen babies.

139. Defendant Rodriguez falsely stated St. Luke's is involved in child trafficking, and in any number of wicked and heinous offenses against society and people of faith, specifically.

**COUNT I
(DEFAMATION (LIBEL AND SLANDER)—
ALL PLAINTIFFS AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

140. Plaintiffs incorporate the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth herein.

141. Defendants have published false, misleading, and defamatory statements about Plaintiffs directed to third parties including, but not limited to:

- a. Defendant Rodriguez falsely and publicly accused St. Luke's of being "world famous" for "mistreating people," "killing people," and "stealing babies from their parents."
- b. Defendant Rodriguez falsely and publicly accused St. Luke's of forcing the Infant to take "toxic poison."
- c. Defendant Rodriguez falsely and publicly accused Plaintiffs of participating in an "organized crime ring" and "harming" the Infant.
- d. Defendants falsely and publicly accused Plaintiffs of kidnapping children.
- e. Defendants repeatedly told their followers and supporters to disrupt St. Luke's operations by protesting, calling in, donating money, and making noise. Followers heeded these commands, resulting in serious threats to Plaintiffs.
- f. Defendant PRN published a wanted poster featuring a headshot of Mr. Roth with the caption: "WANTED: Chris Roth, President/CEO of St. Luke's." Under the headshot, the website falsely accused Mr. Roth of "Criminal accessory of child abduction and deprivation of rights under color of law." Defendants encouraged protestors to make signs using this image.
- g. Defendant FMP published a list of pictures under the heading: "Main People Responsible for Baby Cyrus's Kidnapping." Dr. Erickson's picture was the first on the list. FMP then falsely stated that Dr. Erickson "was the first to call CPS" and accused her of being "the initial trigger that got everything started." FMP later added NP Jungman to the list.
- h. Defendant Rodriguez falsely and publicly stated that Dr. Erickson "had a panic attack and literally sent a CPS worker or social worker to [Rodriguez's] daughter's hospital room to interview her."

- i. Defendant Rodriguez falsely and publicly stated that Dr. Erickson is incompetent at her profession, stating the “hospital doesn’t understand even the basic common-sense things that anybody understands.”
- j. Defendants FMP and Rodriguez published the false statement that experts at St. Luke’s “harm and kill babies all the time.” This false accusation is intended to defame doctors at St. Luke’s including Dr. Erickson.
- k. Defendant Bundy falsely and publicly accused Judge Fortier of taking “hundreds of children . . . with this Doctor Natasha D. Erickson.”
- l. Defendants FMP and Rodriguez published the false statements that NP Jungman “personally financially benefitted from this Child trafficking” and that she “takes innocent little children that have just been ripped from their families and starts looking at and asking them about their privates.”
- m. Defendants FMP and Rodriguez published a false statement implying that NP Jungman committed “medical malpractice.”
- n. Defendant Rodriguez falsely stated that St. Luke’s was involved in kidnapping the Infant for a profit.
- o. Defendant Rodriguez stated that St. Luke’s is connected to a medical mafia.
- p. Defendant Bundy falsely stated that Dr. Erickson misdiagnosed the Infant.
- q. Defendant Bundy falsely stated that Chris Roth and Dr. Erickson are the ones who took the Infant from his parents.
- r. Defendant Bundy falsely stated that St. Luke’s misdiagnosed the Infant multiple times.
- s. Defendant Bundy falsely states that St. Luke’s mistreated and neglected the Infant while the Infant was in their care.
- t. Defendant Bundy falsely stated that St. Luke’s targeted the Infant for kidnapping because of Bundy’s opposition to COVID “corruption”.
- u. Defendant Rodriguez falsely stated St. Luke’s is involved in child trafficking, and in any number of wicked and heinous offenses against people of faith, specifically.

142. These statements were false.

143. At the time Defendants made the statements, they knew the statements were false, or made the statements with reckless disregard for their truth and made such statements with malice.

144. Defendants' statements were not subject to privilege or justified communications.

145. Defendants made or published the statements with the purpose of defaming or disparaging Plaintiffs, in an effort to injure Plaintiffs' business and reputation.

146. Defendants make these false statements in an effort to benefit themselves financially.

147. Defendants' statements involve false allegations of criminal activity and/or involve matters incompatible with business, trade, profession, or office, and are defamatory *per se*.

148. In particular, Defendant Bundy made false statements directed at Dr. Erickson which involve matters incompatible with business, trade, profession, or office, and are defamatory *per se*.

149. Defendants made false statements that Plaintiffs were committing crimes and wrongful acts against Christians or people of faith intending that those false statements would increase the likelihood of their followers or other members of the public would harass and/or commit violence against Plaintiffs.

150. Defendants Rodriguez and Defendant FMP used hate speech directed at the LGBTQ+ community in their false statements against Plaintiffs intending that those false statements would increase the likelihood that their followers or other members of the public would harass and/or commit violence against Plaintiffs.

151. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' publication of such statements, Plaintiffs have suffered economic and non-economic harm in an amount to be proven at trial.

152. Because Defendants' statements were made knowingly, intentionally, willfully, and/or maliciously, Plaintiffs seek punitive damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

**COUNT II
(INVASION OF PRIVACY—MR. ROTH, DR. ERICKSON, AND NP JUNGMAN
AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

153. Plaintiffs Mr. Roth, Dr. Erickson, and NP Jungman incorporate the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth herein.

154. Through their actions described above, Defendants have published materially false statements concerning Mr. Roth, Dr. Erickson, and NP Jungman to third parties.

155. These statements were false.

156. These statements placed Mr. Roth, Dr. Erickson, and NP Jungman in a false light in the public eye.

157. At the time Defendants made the statements, they knew the statements were false, or made the statements with reckless disregard for their truth and made such statements with malice.

158. Defendants' statements were not subject to privilege or justified communications.

159. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' publication of such statements, Mr. Roth, Dr. Erickson, and NP Jungman have suffered damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

160. Because Defendants' actions were done knowingly, intentionally, willfully, and/or maliciously, Mr. Roth, Dr. Erickson, and NP Jungman seek punitive damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

COUNT III
(INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS—
MR. ROTH, DR. ERICKSON, AND NP JUNGMAN AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

161. Plaintiffs Mr. Roth, Dr. Erickson, and NP Jungman incorporate the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth herein.

162. Through their actions described above, Defendants engaged in extreme and outrageous conduct that went beyond all possible bounds of decency in a civilized society.

163. Defendants' conduct was intentional or reckless.

164. As an actual or proximate result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, Mr. Roth, Dr. Erickson, and NP Jungman suffered the requisite injuries.

165. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, Mr. Roth, Dr. Erickson, and NP Jungman have suffered damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

166. Because Defendants' actions were done knowingly, intentionally, willfully, and/or maliciously, Mr. Roth, Dr. Erickson, and NP Jungman seek punitive damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

COUNT IV
(TRESPASS-SLHS AND SLMRC AGAINST BUNDY AND RODRIGUEZ)
(COMMON LAW)

167. Plaintiffs SLHS and SLRMC incorporate the foregoing allegations as if set forth fully herein.

168. Defendant Bundy entered the ambulance bay at St. Luke's Meridian property on Saturday, March 12, 2022.

169. Defendant Bundy did not have permission to be in the ambulance bay at St. Luke's Meridian property.

170. Defendant Bundy remained in the ambulance bay at St. Luke's Meridian property after being instructed to leave and blocked access to the ambulance bay.

171. The ambulance bay at St. Luke's Meridian property is restricted to authorized medical and emergency personnel.

172. Defendant Bundy's presence in the ambulance bay at St. Luke's Meridian property interfered with St. Luke's ability to provide medical care to patients and conduct its business.

173. Defendants Bundy and Rodriguez entered St. Luke's Boise property on Tuesday, March 15, 2022, while leading a large crowd for the express purposes of disrupting hospital operations and generating publicity for a political cause that benefited Defendants and generating revenue for Defendants.

174. Defendants Bundy and Rodriguez did not have permission to enter or remain on St. Luke's Boise property because they were not seeking medical care or treatment and were not authorized visitors.

175. Defendants Bundy and Rodriguez interfered with hospital staff, blocked public access to the hospital, and disrupted hospital operations.

176. Defendants Bundy's and Rodriguez's presence at St. Luke's Boise property interfered with St. Luke's ability to provide medical care to patients and conduct its business.

177. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants Bundy's and Rodriguez's actions, Plaintiff St. Luke's has suffered damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

**COUNT V
(TRESPASS-SLHS AND SLRMC AGAINST BUNDY AND RODRIGUEZ)
(STATUTORY TRESPASS PURSUANT TO I.C. § 6-202)**

178. Plaintiffs SLHS and SLRMC incorporate the foregoing allegations as if set forth fully herein.

179. Defendant Bundy entered the ambulance bay at St. Luke's Meridian property on Saturday, March 12, 2022.

180. Defendant Bundy did not have permission to be in the ambulance bay at St. Luke's Meridian property.

181. Defendant Bundy acted intentionally and willfully when he entered and remained in the ambulance bay at St. Luke's Meridian property.

182. Defendant Bundy remained in the ambulance bay at St. Luke's Meridian property after being instructed to leave and blocked access to the ambulance bay.

183. The ambulance bay at St. Luke's Meridian property is not open to the public and is not accessible by the public. Entry into the ambulance bay is restricted to authorized medical personnel, emergency responders, and patients seeking emergency care.

184. Defendant Bundy's presence in the ambulance bay at St. Luke's Meridian property interfered with St. Luke's ability to provide medical care to patients and conduct its business. Bundy took this action for an improper purpose.

185. Defendants Bundy and Rodriguez entered St. Luke's Boise property on Tuesday, March 15, 2022, as protestors. Bundy and Rodriguez took these actions for improper purposes.

186. Defendants Bundy and Rodriguez acted intentionally and willfully when they entered and remained present at St. Luke's Boise property.

187. St. Luke's Boise property is open to the public who are actively seeking medical care or treatment. St. Luke's lawfully restricts access to its Boise property to patients and authorized visitors only.

188. Defendants Bundy and Rodriguez did not have permission to enter or remain on St. Luke's Boise property because they were not seeking medical care or treatment and were not authorized visitors.

189. Defendants Bundy and Rodriguez interfered with hospital staff and patients, blocked public access to the hospital, and disrupted hospital operations.

190. Defendants Bundy's and Rodriguez's presence at St. Luke's Boise property interfered with St. Luke's ability to provide medical care to patients and conduct its business.

191. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants Bundy's and Rodriguez's actions, Plaintiff St. Luke's has suffered damages in an amount to be proven at trial and should be awarded attorneys' fees relating to this claim and pursuant to I.C. § 6-202(3)(a)(ii) (civil trespass). In the event of default, SLHS and SLRMC each should be awarded damages for this cause of action in an amount of no less than \$250,000 from each Defendant, Bundy and Rodriguez, and in addition, in the amount of \$50,000 in attorneys' fees relating to this claim from Bundy and Rodriguez.

**COUNT VI
(UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES—ALL PLAINTIFFS AGAINST DEFENDANTS
BUNDY, RODRIGUEZ, AND FMP)**

192. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference each of the foregoing allegations as if set forth fully herein.

193. Defendants engage in political activism, the marketing of the personal brands of Bundy and Rodriguez, and related business activities for financial gain.

194. Ammon Bundy is in the business of generating revenue for himself, his political campaign, the PRN, and other businesses he owns, such as Abish-husbandi, Inc. and Dono Custos, Inc, by marketing his personal brand as a political activist and leader to garner donations, revenues, and fees.

195. Rodriguez generates revenue for himself and his businesses through his personal brand, his political activism, the FM PAC, FMP, sale of his self-published books, speaking engagements, provision of marketing services to the Bundy for Governor Campaign, and through

his consulting services sold through the Power Marketing entities. For example, Rodriguez exploits the likeness of the Infant and the notoriety created by the false narrative regarding the Infant to advertise Power Marketing.

196. FMP owns and operates freedomman.org. FMP generates revenue and/or other benefits for Rodriguez through traffic to the site and by serving as a marketing vehicle for Rodriguez's business ventures, including, but not limited to, Freedom Tabernacle Incorporated and the Power Marketing entities.

197. SLHS and SLRMC are not-for-profit companies which provide medical services in Idaho.

198. Mr. Roth is the CEO and President of SLHS.

199. Dr. Erickson is a physician employed by SLRMC.

200. NP Jungman is a nurse practitioner employed by SLRMC.

201. In the conduct of trade or commerce and in seeking revenue for themselves, Bundy, Rodriguez, and FMP engaged in methods, acts, and practices unlawful under Idaho Code title 48, chapter 6, including, but not limited to, falsely disparaging the business and professional reputation of the St. Luke's Parties.

202. Bundy, Rodriguez, and FMP knew, or in the exercise of due care should have known, that they engaged in unconscionable methods, acts, or practices in the conduct of trade or commerce, as provided in Idaho Code § 48-603C.

203. The actions and practices of Bundy, Rodriguez, and FMP are misleading, false, or deceptive.

204. Bundy's, Rodriguez's, and FMP's conduct and pattern of conduct are outrageous and offensive to the public conscience.

205. As a direct result of these wrongful acts and practices, the St. Luke's Parties have been damaged more than \$250,000.00, in an amount to be proven at trial.

COUNT VII
(IDAHO CHARITABLE SOLICITATION ACT—ALL PLAINTIFFS AGAINST
DEFENDANTS RODRIGUEZ AND FMP)

206. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference each of the foregoing allegations as if set forth fully herein.

207. Defendants Rodriguez and FMP engaged in the solicitation of charitable contributions to the "Save Baby Cyrus from Medical Kidnapping" campaign.

<https://givesendgo.com/babycyrus>.

208. Defendants Rodriguez and FMP solicited charitable contributions based on false statements regarding supposed medical bills owed to SLHS and SLRMC. In truth, the parents of the Infant never made any payments to SLHS or SLRMC for medical services and owe no money to SLHS or SLRMC for medical services as the medical services were covered by government programs.

209. Defendant Rodriguez and FMP planned, conducted, and executed solicitations for charitable contributions by utilizing unfair, false, deceptive, misleading, or unconscionable acts and practices.

210. In soliciting for charitable contributions, Rodriguez and FMP engaged in methods, acts, and practices unlawful under Idaho Code title 48, chapter 12, including, but not limited to, falsely disparaging the business and professional reputation of the St. Luke's Parties, manufacturing a false conspiracy of kidnapping, trafficking, and killing of children involving the St. Luke's Parties, and falsely representing the amount of liability incurred relating to medical expenses associated with treatment of the Infant.

211. SLHS and SLRMC are not-for-profit companies which provide medical services in Idaho that were disparaged as part of the charitable solicitation.

212. Mr. Roth is the CEO and President of SLHS who was disparaged and part of the charitable solicitation.

213. Dr. Erickson is a physician employed by SLRMC who was disparaged as part of the charitable solicitation.

214. NP Jungman is a nurse practitioner employed by SLRMC who was disparaged as part of the charitable solicitation.

215. Rodriguez and FMP knew, or in the exercise of due care should have known, that they engaged in unconscionable methods, acts, or practices in the conduct of trade or commerce, as provided in Idaho Code § 48-603C, standards incorporated into the Idaho Charitable Solicitations Act.

216. The actions and practices of Rodriguez and FMP relating to the solicitation of the charitable contributions were and continue to be misleading, false, or deceptive.

217. Rodriguez's and FMP's conduct and pattern of conduct are outrageous and offensive to the public conscience.

218. As a direct result of these wrongful acts, Rodriguez and FMP caused more than \$115,000 to be donated wrongfully.

219. As a direct result of these wrongful acts and practices, the St. Luke's Parties have been damaged owing to the false and defamatory statements to generate donations.

220. As a direct result of these wrongful acts and practices, the public has been misled.

221. Rodriguez and FMP should be assessed damages and attorneys' fees (pursuant to I.C. §§ 48-608, 48-1205), in an amount proven at trial pursuant to the purpose of the Idaho

Charitable Solicitations Act. In the event of default, Rodriguez and FMP should be forced to disgorge at least \$115,000 and pay attorneys' fees in the amount of \$50,000 to Plaintiffs for fees incurred relating to this claim.

**COUNT VIII
(CIVIL CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT DEFAMATION, INVASION OF PRIVACY,
INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS, TRESPASS, UNFAIR
BUSINESS PRACTICES, AND WRONGFUL CHARITABLE SOLICITATIONS—ALL
PLAINTIFFS AGAINST DEFENDANTS)**

222. Plaintiffs incorporate the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth herein.

223. Defendants each willfully, intentionally, and knowingly agreed and conspired with each other to publish false, misleading, and defamatory statements about Plaintiffs directed to third parties, as described above.

224. Defendants Rodriguez and Bundy further agreed and conspired to unlawfully trespass on Plaintiff St. Luke's property.

225. In furtherance of this conspiracy, Defendants defamed all Plaintiffs, invaded the privacy of Mr. Roth, Dr. Erickson, and NP Jungman, intentionally inflicted emotional distress on Mr. Roth, Dr. Erickson, and NP Jungman, unlawfully trespassed onto Plaintiff St. Luke's property, committed unfair trade practices against all Plaintiffs, and defamed all Plaintiffs in furtherance of a conspiracy to violate the Idaho Charitable Solicitation Act.

226. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

227. By virtue of the formation and operation of this conspiracy, Defendants, as participants in the conspiracy, are liable as joint tortfeasors for each other's misconduct.

REQUEST FOR JURY TRIAL

Pursuant to Idaho Rule of Civil Procedure 38, Plaintiffs hereby request trial by jury as to all issues that are properly so tried.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Counterclaimants respectfully request the following relief from this Court:

- A. An award to each of the St. Luke's Parties from each of the Defendants for damages in the sum to be proven at trial but in no event less than \$250,000;
- B. Injunctive relief requiring the Defendants: (1) to cease posting and disseminating defamatory statements against the St. Luke's Parties; (2) to cease making statements that the St. Luke's Parties are criminals and/or participate in the kidnapping, trafficking, sexual or any other abuse, and/or killing of children; (3) to remove from all online locations Defendants have authority to do so any and all statements that the St. Luke's Parties are criminals and/or participating in the kidnapping, trafficking, sexual or any other abuse, and/or killing of children; (4) to cease disseminating and encouraging others to disseminate the contact information, personal information, and images of Mr. Roth, Dr. Erickson, and NP Jungman; and (5) to remove from all online locations Defendants have authority to do so the contact information, personal information, and/or images of Mr. Roth, Dr. Erickson, and NP Jungman.
- C. An award to the St. Luke's Parties of their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs for this matter under Idaho Code §§ 12-120(3), 12-121, 6-202(3)(a)(ii) (civil trespass), 48-608 (unfair business practices), and 48-1205 (Charitable Solicitation Act), or other applicable authorities and statutes;
- D. An award of punitive damages in the sum to be proven at trial; and
- E. Provide such other relief as the Court determines fair, just, and appropriate under the circumstances.

DATED this 3rd day of March, 2023.

HOLLAND & HART LLP

By: /s/Erik F. Stidham

Erik F. Stidham

Jennifer M. Jensen

Counsel for Plaintiffs

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 3rd day of March, 2023, I caused to be filed and served, via iCourt, a true and correct copy of the foregoing by the method indicated below, and addressed to the following:

Ammon Bundy for Governor
P.O. Box 370
Emmett, ID 83617

- ☐ U.S. Mail
- ☒ Hand Delivered Via Process Server
- ☐ Overnight Mail
- ☐ Email/iCourt/eServe:

Ammon Bundy for Governor
c/o Ammon Bundy
4615 Harvest Ln.
Emmett, ID 83617-3601

- ☐ U.S. Mail
- ☒ Hand Delivered Via Process Server
- ☐ Overnight Mail
- ☐ Email/iCourt/eServe:

Ammon Bundy
4615 Harvest Ln.
Emmett, ID 83617-3601

- ☐ U.S. Mail
- ☒ Hand Delivered Via Process Server
- ☐ Overnight Mail
- ☐ Email/iCourt/eServe:

People's Rights Network
c/o Ammon Bundy
4615 Harvest Ln.
Emmett, ID 83617-3601

- ☐ U.S. Mail
- ☒ Hand Delivered Via Process Server
- ☐ Overnight Mail
- ☐ Email/iCourt/eServe:

People's Rights Network
c/o Ammon Bundy
P.O. Box 370
Emmett, ID 83617

- ☐ U.S. Mail
- ☒ Hand Delivered Via Process Server
- ☐ Overnight Mail
- ☐ Email/iCourt/eServe:

Freedom Man Press LLC
c/o Diego Rodriguez
1317 Edgewater Dr. #5077
Orlando, FL 32804

- ☒ U.S. Mail
- ☐ Hand Delivered
- ☐ Overnight Mail
- ☐ Email/iCourt/eServe:

Freedom Man Press LLC
c/o Diego Rodriguez
9169 W. State St., Ste. 3177
Boise, ID 83714

- ☒ U.S. Mail
- ☐ Hand Delivered
- ☐ Overnight Mail
- ☐ Email/iCourt/eServe:

Freedom Man PAC
c/o Diego Rodriguez
1317 Edgewater Dr., #5077
Orlando, FL 32804

- ☒ U.S. Mail
- ☐ Hand Delivered
- ☐ Overnight Mail
- ☐ Email/iCourt/eServe:

Diego Rodriguez
1317 Edgewater Dr., #5077
Orlando, FL 32804

- ☐ U.S. Mail
- ☐ Hand Delivered
- ☐ Overnight Mail
- ☒ Email/iCourt/eServe:
freedommanpress@protonmail.com

/s/Erik F. Stidham

Erik F. Stidham
OF HOLLAND & HART LLP

21000177_v1

EXHIBIT B

(Diego Rodriguez's Response to the Fourth Amended Complaint)

Diego Rodriguez
1317 Edgewater Drive #5077
Orlando, FL 32804
(208) 891-7728

**IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF
IDAHO, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ADA**

ST. LUKE’S HEALTH SYSTEM, LTD; ST.
LUKE’S REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER,
LTD; CHRIS ROTH, an individual; NATASHA
D. ERICKSON, MD, an individual; and
TRACY W. JUNGMAN, NP, an individual,
Plaintiffs,

vs.

AMMON BUNDY, an individual; AMMON
BUNDY FOR GOVERNOR, a political
organization; DIEGO RODRIGUEZ, an
individual; FREEDOM MAN PRESS LLC, a
limited liability company; FREEDOM MAN
PAC, a registered political action committee;
and PEOPLE’S RIGHTS NETWORK, a
political organization,
Defendants.

Case No. CV01-22-06789

**ANSWER TO FOURTH AMENDED
COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY
TRIAL**

Diego Rodriguez , for his Answer to the FOURTH AMENDED COMPLAINT AND DEMAND
FOR JURY TRIAL, states:

1. The complete tenor, purpose, and intent of this lawsuit/complaint is flawed, full of lies
and deception, based on malice and ill intent, and is shocking to the consciences of
decent human beings everywhere.
2. On March 11th, 2022, my Grandson, Cyrus Anderson, known and referred to as “Baby
Cyrus” was wrongfully kidnapped by Meridian Police officers who broke no less than 8

laws in the process of kidnapping Baby Cyrus. This information has already been widely disseminated and demonstrated to the public and pending litigation will demonstrate it even further.

3. After Baby Cyrus was illegally kidnapped, he was taken to St. Luke's Hospital and kept in their custody UNLAWFULLY for days, while they profited off of his presence in their hospital.
4. Myself and many others were shocked and appalled to learn that St. Luke's Hospital and the State of Idaho receive compensation for such illegal kidnappings and have been doing so since 1997 when the ASFA law was passed.
5. We went on to protest legally and peacefully in front of St. Luke's hospital and I also personally published in every medium possible the facts we learned about the entire ordeal which included but is not limited to the fact that: St. Luke's Hospital profits off of medical kidnapping; doctors and staff at St. Luke's hospital including the plaintiffs named in this case act knowingly as kidnappers by using CPS as a weapon to steal babies and profit off of them, they do so knowingly and intentionally particularly when parents do not submit to their authority in medical decisions for their children (a tactic they call going "AMA – against medical advice), and they are specifically hostile towards families who choose not to use vaccines for their children; that St. Luke's hospital earned millions of dollars from COVID monies; that St. Luke's hospital has killed babies in the past through incompetence; that relationships, history, and anecdotes all demonstrate that the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare along with many other bad actors in what could only be referred to as the "Idaho Swamp" including police (particularly the Meridian Police Department), judges (particularly Judge Laurie Fortier), the C.A.R.E.S. staff and

many others are all participants in this system of profiting from child kidnapping that could only be described as “government subsidized child trafficking.”

6. Everything I stated and published is either completely true or is something I believe to be completely true. In America, we have the right to Freedom of Speech and no one can compel me to not speak the truth about any subject—particularly when the welfare and safety of my own grandson is involved.
7. This lawsuit is nothing more than what has been colloquially referred to as a “SLAPP suit”—a baseless lawsuit designed to silence political opposition. As described and defined by Middle Tennessee State University, *“A SLAPP suit, or strategic lawsuit against public participation, is a civil claim filed against an individual or an organization, arising out of that party’s speech or communication to government about an issue of public concern. At the heart of the SLAPP suit is the petition clause of the First Amendment. ‘SLAPP’ was coined to recognize lawsuits filed to silence criticism A SLAPP suit may look like a civil lawsuit for defamation, nuisance, interference with contract, interference with economic advantage, or invasion of privacy, but its purpose is different. About this purpose, Judge J. Nicholas Colabella wrote in Gordon v. Marrone (N.Y. 1992), “Short of a gun to the head, a greater threat to First Amendment expression can scarcely be imagined.”* Professors George W. Pring and Penelope Canan coined the term SLAPP suit in the 1980s after noting a surge in lawsuits filed to silence public criticism by citizens. SLAPP suits arise when citizens erect signs on their own property, speak at public meetings, report violations of environmental laws, testify before Congress or state legislatures, or protest publicly, among many other similar acts, thereby prompting a party who claims to be aggrieved by such acts — often developers,

merchants, and even public officials — to file suit. SLAPP suits can interfere with First Amendment rights. The petition clause of the First Amendment guarantees, in part, “the right of the people. . .to petition the government for a redress of grievances.” The abridgment of this right distinguishes a SLAPP suit from other cases based on similar allegations.

8. This lawsuit is a perfect textbook case of a SLAPP suit, and it is shocking to the conscience of all with human decency that the court system would be used to silence the voice of a grandfather who is criticizing a system that illegally kidnapped his grandson!

9. Additionally, this case if it is allowed to stand is an affront to 1st Amendment rights. I have the right to speak whatever I choose to speak—particularly when what I am speaking is completely true or I believe it to be true.

10. I plead a defense of petition clause immunity and ask the court to dismiss this case at once.

11. Additionally, in response to the baseless FOURTH AMENDED COMPLAINT from the Plaintiffs, I issue the following:

12. PARAGRAPH 1 – How sick and twisted could someone possibly be to even imagine that I was engaging in a “grift” as they call it—that I was trying to gain money and publicity from the kidnapping of my grandson. This level of depravity is rare, and one can only assume that the plaintiffs or their counsel are acting in perfect alignment with the textbook psychological definition of “projection,” which means that they accuse you of doing what they would do. Normal, decent and honest citizens with integrity would never think to use the most horrifying experience in their entire life—the kidnapping of a precious baby, in this case my own grandson—for profit! How sick, twisted, and

disgusting do you have to be to even consider such a thing? The only intent I had was to get my grandson back! It's pretty simple. You kidnap my grandson and I am going to do everything possible to get him back. And yes, that will include publishing TRUE FACTS about the people who were responsible for his kidnapping, or who had Baby Cyrus in their possession.

13. PARAGRAPH 2 – There was no “smear campaign.” There was the publication and pronouncement of facts. Everything that was published has been demonstrated to be true, and even the plaintiffs have been unable to demonstrate that a single publication or pronouncement that I have ever made was false—even though I have given them the chance to do so. If there is any smear campaign, it is on behalf of the plaintiffs and their counsel. Again, they are using classic “projection”—accusing me of doing what they are doing. Additionally, I never once incited anyone to violence nor would I do so. I am a Christian minister, and I don't believe in violence except in the case of self-defense. I never encouraged any acts of violence against anyone and the fact that the plaintiffs have been unable to demonstrate a single instance where I did shows again how baseless and immoral this lawsuit is in the first place.

14. PARAGRAPH 3 – I never mischaracterized the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare's “decision to intervene.” On the contrary, everything I have published and everything which remains available online for the world to see demonstrates that Baby Cyrus's kidnapping was not only illegal but demonstrably horrific and terrifying to the public conscience. They used the false premise of “imminent danger” to justify taking Baby Cyrus by force when the proof has already been published that all 3 parties involved in his kidnapping: the IDHW, St. Luke's Hospital, and the Meridian Police

Department all knew Baby Cyrus was not in “imminent danger.” Video evidence along with medical records which declare this to be so have already been published and reviewed thousands of times by the public—the evidence is plain.

15. PARAGRAPH 4 – Of course I claimed and stated that St. Luke’s Parties were participants since they were! They received and kept Baby Cyrus in their custody. They financially profited from Baby Cyrus. We don’t know how much yet, but through printed communication we have already received, we know that St. Luke’s hospital received no less than \$34,000 for having Baby Cyrus illegally in their custody after he was forcefully, violently, and illegally removed from his parents. The kidnapping, of course, was all filmed, and it has been viewed more than 12 million times by a horrified public all over the world.

16. PARAGRAPH 5 – Ammon Bundy and I didn’t “coordinate attacks” against anyone or anything. But even if we did “coordinate” our message, so what? Ammon Bundy is my friend and he is a close friend of our family, and he likewise loves Baby Cyrus. I would do for him the same as he did for our family if the situation were reversed. And furthermore, it is not illegal to “coordinate” messages and publications. So each of these baseless assertions amounts to nothing more than whining and complaining about the fact that you are being exposed. Furthermore, their baseless and unscrupulous attempt to rope in any of several organizations that Ammon or I are associated with is truly vile. We had one goal—to get Baby Cyrus back and nothing else. Neither Ammon nor I received a single solitary cent of profit in the course of fighting for Baby Cyrus. On the contrary, we both suffered greatly as a result of this process. My entire family suffered financially. When your child is kidnapped, do you think you can go to work the next day and act like

nothing has happened? Families financial situations are ruined as a result of these types of kidnapping cases. My son-in-law could not work. I could not work. Nobody in my family could work. We were emotionally devastated and dedicated every waking hour of every day to do whatever was necessary to get Baby Cyrus back. The websites mentioned by the plaintiffs do not earn money, on the contrary, they cost me money. I have never made a red cent off of that website. And no other entity mentioned used this situation for financial gain. There was a GiveSendGo campaign started for Baby Cyrus's parents to help raise money for legal expenses and their own personal financial support during this time, but that is an obvious response to a kidnapping incident and the monies raised went to Baby Cyrus's parents and not to any defendant named in this case. Shame on the Plaintiffs and their counsel for making such an evil and baseless accusation. In doing so, they are only showing the wickedness of their own hearts and demonstrating to the world that that is what they would do in such a situation because their hearts are evil.

17. PARAGRAPH 6 – the St. Luke's parties evidently and obviously do not bring this lawsuit to protect anything else other than their own exposure. This is an immoral and unconscionable SLAPP suit that should be dismissed.

18. PARAGRAPH 16 – how dare you claim that our church is not a real church but only “purports to be a church.” Freedom Tabernacle has operated as a Christian church since 2011, a full 9 years before I ever even met Ammon Bundy. We have Christian services, bible studies, baptisms, marriages, and engage in a whole host of other Christian ministries. We follow the Biblical example of a house church (1 Corinthians 16:19, Philemon 1:2, Romans 16:5) and therefore don't waste God's resources on commercial rent and the like. Just because you don't like the members of the church doesn't give you

the right to claim that the church is not real. You should be ashamed of yourselves.

Furthermore, you contradicted yourself by stating that Freedom Tabernacle only

“purports to be a church” but then go on to claim that I am “financially motivated to grow Freedom Tabernacle,” which infers that you recognize it as an *actual* church.

Additionally, you claim that I used an “enhanced profile and manufactured conspiracy relating to the Infant to sell three-day “training” courses through Power Marketing for which he charges \$15,000 per student.” This only demonstrates your incompetence, foolishness, and ignorance. I have never used anything relating to Baby Cyrus to sell anything, EVER! What you are evidently referring to is a broadcast on Rick Green’s podcast where we discussed the Baby Cyrus case before going on to promote a 3-day Entrepreneurial Boot Camp for young people to learn how to become entrepreneurs.

What you failed to pay attention to was the fact that this 3-day course, was given to the 20 students who would attend it for FREE! Again, you have shown that you are so completely possessed with wickedness and evil, that your confirmation bias does not allow you to see any truth, facts, or reality, even when it is clearly described for you. Go back and watch the video again. This is just more evidence that the plaintiffs and/or their counsel are unethical in their malicious intent to try and deny me my 1st amendment right to free speech and to financially destroy me using this very court as a weapon, that they are unable to tell the truth, or at least state facts accurately, in their official court filings.

19. PARAGRAPH 17 – again, the plaintiffs or their counsel are simply unable to get facts right and likewise are attempting to just throw enough mud at the wall in the vain hope that some of it will stick. The corporate entities mentioned have nothing to do with the Baby Cyrus case, but are all separate entities. And even if they weren’t, that would have

no relevance to the case, particularly and specifically since no defendant named in this case has ever gained a single penny off of Baby Cyrus's kidnapping. On the contrary, we all suffered greatly, both emotionally and financially.

20. PARAGRAPH 18 – FreedomMan.org is my personal blog. There is no “Freedom Man Press, LLC” and the plaintiffs know that. And we do not advocate for the harassment of political opponents through “doxing” as this paragraph claims. But even if I did, that would not be illegal. So again, plaintiffs or their counsel are showing their deep seated desire to bring as much nonsense to the case as possible to frustrate the process and to bury me and the defense in meaningless discussions and debates about irrelevant subjects. This just amounts to more whining and complaining as if the plaintiff is a child on the recess playground using the court system to gripe about others who did or said things they don't like. The court should not allow itself to be abused in this fashion.

21. PARAGRAPH 21 – I do not believe the court has personal jurisdiction over me based on Idaho Code § 5-514 since I have not done any of the acts enumerated in this statute.

22. PARAGRAPH 22 – The venue is not proper according to the Idaho Code §§ 5-401 and 5-404 as no real property is under consideration, and I was not a legal resident of Idaho at the time of Baby Cyrus's kidnapping.

23. PARAGRAPH 24 – Idaho's statute is much more specific than just “concerns about a child's safety.” The statute specifically states, that a mandatory reporter must report if a child under 18 “has been abused, abandoned or neglected or who observes the child being subjected to conditions or circumstances that would reasonably result in abuse, abandonment or neglect...” If there is no reason to believe that parents are abusing or causing a child to be abused, abandoned, or neglected, then there is no requirement to

make a referral to IDHW. A parent refusing medical advice does not qualify as “abuse.” So the entire foundation of any CPS referral for Baby Cyrus is false unless anyone can provide evidence that Marissa and Levi (Baby Cyrus’s parents), were abusing Baby Cyrus or were subjecting him to conditions or circumstances that would reasonably result in abuse. Nobody has provided a shred of evidence to this end. Therefore, the entire case was baseless from the start.

24. PARAGRAPH 25 – As already mentioned and already proved repeatedly in public in multiple venues and which can clearly be seen with the evidence provided on this page (<https://www.freedomman.org/cyrus/archive/zero-evidence-for-imminent-danger/> and <https://www.freedomman.org/cyrus/archive/they-lied-to-you-baby-cyrus-was-healthy-baby-when-kidnapped/>), Baby Cyrus was never in “imminent danger” and the police who took him knew he was not in imminent danger. The Idaho Department of Health and Welfare knew he was not in imminent danger, and St. Luke’s Hospital knew he was not in imminent danger. The IDHW and the Meridian Police department both knew because they had already prepared to take Baby Cyrus to a foster family within minutes of him being kidnapped but only decided not to do so because protestors had gathered in front of the hospital. This was published in the medical report and the entire world has seen it. If Baby Cyrus was about to die being in “imminent danger” then why would they take him to a foster family, to complete strangers who are not doctors, to be put in their custody? Obviously, he was not in “imminent danger” and they knew it. St. Luke’s hospital likewise knew because the doctor who reviewed Baby Cyrus when he was brought in clearly stated in her report that Baby Cyrus was a perfectly “healthy baby” and that there were “no acute life threats” noted. Very specifically, the St. Luke’s doctor stated that Baby

Cyrus's life was not in danger at all. To keep Baby Cyrus after making this official diagnosis is both evil and diabolical.

25. PARAGRAPH 27 – Baby Cyrus was determined by St. Luke's hospital itself to not be in imminent danger. So the entire case is a farce.

26. PARAGRAPH 30 – It is a complete lie to state that Baby Cyrus would not breastfeed.

On the contrary, nursing was at the time his only source of nutrition. To take him away forcefully from his only source of nutrition was, in and of itself, the greatest form of child endangerment imaginable.

27. PARAGRAPH 32 – In this paragraph the plaintiffs are tacitly admitting that Dr. Natasha Erickson used CPS as a threat in order to force Levi and Marissa to obey her. CPS is supposed to be used to protect children not used as a weapon to control parents.

28. PARAGRAPH 33 – Numerous doctors have already stated and will provide affidavits if necessary to describe how the nasal feeding tube given to Baby Cyrus was totally unnecessary. Not only was it unnecessary, but after returning home from St. Luke's custody, Baby Cyrus had a C-DIFF infection which is a terrible infection that is known to come from hospitals and specifically from nasal feeding tubes. Nurse Tracy Jungmann even jammed the tube back into Baby Cyrus's nose after it had fallen out, and had been dangling about for hours, without sanitizing it, sterilizing it, or replacing it. Baby Cyrus did not have a C-DIFF infection before being kidnapped and this infection has taken a serious toll on Baby Cyrus. The only known place where Baby Cyrus could have contracted this infection is at St. Luke's hospital.

29. PARAGRAPH 35 – This is an outright lie and it is shocking that you would include such a lie. It either demonstrates your complete lack of respect and disregard for the court

system, or your utter incompetence since you are claiming that “neither Dr. Erickson nor any St. Luke’s employee initiated contact with child welfare or any other division of DHW regarding the Infant’s hospitalization.” However, we have the medical records that clearly state that Dr. Natasha Erickson is the one who made the CPS referral. Why do you lie so blatantly when your own records state the opposite?

30. PARAGRAPH 36 – This is another outright lie. Nobody tried to arrange a visit to the Infant’s home on March 5th or 6th. And there are no records demonstrating otherwise. Specifically, there were no voicemails or text messages left for Levi or Marissa to return.

31. PARAGRAPH 40 – How could the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare make the diagnosis of Baby Cyrus being in a “life threatening and/or emergency situation” when no single solitary person at the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare had seen Baby Cyrus personally? How can you make a diagnosis without seeing someone?

32. PARAGRAPHS 44 & 45 – The lies are endless! The police came to a house where I had an office for my business. I did not live in that house, nor did Levi and Marissa. Nobody lived in that house—it was used as an office. The day police came, I answered the door and there were 3 other young men helping me pack since we were tearing the entire office down and were preparing to move it all out of state. So there are 3 witnesses to attest to the fact that nobody “refused to cooperate, provide information, or let the officers see the infant.”

33. PARAGRAPH 47 – More lies and/or incompetence demonstrating the inability of the plaintiffs or their counsel to report any factual data accurately. Here it states that “When the police left the house to get a warrant, the Infant and the Infant’s parents moved to another location.” You people are so ignorant and incompetent and so willing to LIE that

you never even check your data to ensure your facts are right. The house they came to was 1876 E Adelaide in Meridian, Idaho, and Levi and Marissa have never lived at that address. Furthermore, they were not present at the time that the police came, so this claim is completely false. If the plaintiffs and/or their counsel can't be trusted to get basic facts right, then how can this baseless case be considered anything more than a frivolous lawsuit with fake allegations that can't be trusted?

34. PARAGRAPH 49 – Levi and Marissa never “refused to cooperate.” On the contrary, Marissa kindly and gently cooperated with police officers who promised her she would never be separated from Baby Cyrus and that she could ride with him to the hospital. Millions of people have seen the belligerent thug, Sargent Christopher McGilvery lie multiple times to Marissa’s face and tell her she would not be separated from Baby Cyrus. The truth is that Meridian Police refused to cooperate with Levi and Marissa who are the legal parents of Baby Cyrus and who have never done a thing to put him in harm. By kidnapping Baby Cyrus, the police were endangering Baby Cyrus since he has cyclical vomiting syndrome and his only source of nutrition at the time was his mother’s breast milk. The police knew this as Marissa told them, yet they took him anyway. This is pre-meditated child endangerment! Additionally, the police abused Levi, Marissa, and Baby Cyrus’s aunt by physically harming them, slamming Levi’s face against the truck, handcuffing him without cause, ripping Miranda (Baby Cyrus’s aunt) through the window and falsely arresting her without cause, and then arresting Marissa without cause and putting her in handcuffs after suffering the trauma of having her only child ripped from her arms by thugs with guns, and then being subject to physical humiliation when a police officer, Sean King (who had previously resigned his position at the Caldwell

police department during an investigation for sexual misconduct), groped Marissa and put his hands up her blouse and down her pants and around her waist. All of this can be seen from the bodycam footage which has been posted for all the world to see. And millions of people have seen it and have been rightfully appalled at the misconduct of these tyrannical police officers.

35. PARAGRAPH 51 – I don’t care if St. Luke’s had any authority or role in the taking of Baby Cyrus. The point is that St. Luke’s received Baby Cyrus after he was kidnapped and kept him in their custody, earning over \$34,000 from him, even after their own doctor diagnosed him as being a “healthy baby” and not having any “acute life threats”—meaning that Baby Cyrus was never in imminent danger.

36. PARAGRAPH 53 – This is simply not true. Baby Cyrus has Cyclical Vomiting Syndrome which is a genetic disorder that causes him to go into long fits of vomiting. St Luke’s doctors were totally unable to diagnose this problem and totally incompetent in their handling of the situation. And Baby Cyrus’s health did not “dramatically worsen” under the parent’s care. The truth is he dramatically worsened under St. Luke’s care and even contracted a C-DIFF infection.

37. PARAGRAPH 54 – Baby Cyrus’s health did not improve. He simply gained water weight from the nasal tube and the I.V. But that does not equate to “health.”

38. PARAGRAPH 55 – How remarkable that the plaintiffs include this statement when it was Dr. Natasha Erickson from the get-go who could care less to listen to any of Baby Cyrus’s medical history from the parents when they first came to St. Luke’s. Marissa attempted desperately to explain Baby Cyrus’s history, her experiences with Baby Cyrus, and specific accounts and anecdotes regarding his vomiting episodes, but Dr. Natasha

Erickson wouldn't listen, didn't care, and would not even let her finish as she simply determined to do what she was going to do and order up all the tests she wanted and to follow her allopathic protocols, whether they worked or not.

39. PARAGRAPH 57 – I never once stated that St. Luke's vaccinated Baby Cyrus. So here they go lying again. How many lies are they going to tell before the court realizes that this is a baseless and frivolous case, based on lies and rightfully throws the case out? However, they certainly did "harm Baby Cyrus in irreparable ways." In fact, Baby Cyrus has suffered since he was returned with what can only be described as PTSD. How sick and disgusting is a hospital that won't even allow a child's parents to stay with him? If they truly cared for Baby Cyrus, they would have allowed Levi and Marissa to stay with him permanently. And if they cared about righteousness and morality, they never would have kept Baby Cyrus in the first place.
40. PARAGRAPH 58 – the assessment that Baby Cyrus's condition improved significantly is doubtful at best, completely erroneous at worst. In any event, it is still subjective as we have other medical experts who would beg to differ. Having St. Luke's make conclusions about their quality of care is like asking the government to review itself to see if they acted tyrannically or not. The conclusion will always be the same, "we audited ourselves and we determined that we have done nothing wrong." Sorry, but that is simply not acceptable or believable. Baby Cyrus's C-DIFF infection alone is sufficient evidence that he did not improve while being held illegally as a medical prisoner at St. Luke's hospital.

41. PARAGRAPH 61 – Baby Cyrus did not have a severe, life threatening malnutrition or dehydration, and even if he did, it was not and would not have been caused by his parents and therefore it was illegal to forcefully remove him from his parent’s custody.
42. PARAGRAPH 62 – what “other defendants” are you referring to? You previously stated that People’s Rights (which is not a legal entity and does not exist legally) is indistinguishable from Ammon Bundy and that Freedom Man Press (which likewise does not exist legally) and Freedom Man PAC are indistinguishable from Diego Rodriguez. So which one is it—are Ammon Bundy and Diego Rodriguez the only defendants since they are indistinguishable from the entities named as co-defendants? Or are there “other defendants” as you have stated in this paragraph?
43. PARAGRAPH 63 – Here you go again making demonstrably and empirically false claims with no evidence whatsoever. And not only do they make no sense, but they are shockingly ridiculous. Ammon Bundy does not make any money off of his “personal brand” nor do I. My own work and business are not connected in any way to any political activism and all efforts that I have made in regards to Freedom Man PAC, Freedom Man Press (my own personal blog), or the Baby Cyrus case have cost me money and not earned me a dime. A simple browsing of Freedom Man PACs donation records with the Secretary of State will show that monies donated to the PAC for political marketing campaigns were donated by myself. So I have paid out of pocket for all political activity, and I likewise self-funded any and all costs associated with the Baby Cyrus kidnapping.
44. PARAGRAPH 64 – You just can’t stop telling lies and making yourself a psychology textbook example of “projection” where you accuse others of doing what you would do.

First of all, the only thing we intended to do was EXPOSE the wickedness of all bad actors in Baby Cyrus's kidnapping story so that we could get Baby Cyrus returned home safely before he was killed by St. Luke's hospital (which was a real and genuine threat since they have a history of killing children through incompetence—a history which has been documented from real stories already published through news websites and even a personal story from a personal friend whose 10 month old son was killed by St. Luke's hospital's incompetence). In the process of doing so, we discovered the government subsidized child trafficking scheme which has been going on since 1997, and I felt duty bound by God to expose this and publish it as far and wide as possible. And I will continue to do so, since it is 100% accurate and true. It is a fact that the federal government financial incentivizes local states to kidnap children without just cause, and it is a fact that nearly all the agencies involved and untold numbers of bureaucracies financially profit off of this child trafficking including the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare and St. Luke's hospital. These are simple facts that cannot be disputed.

45. PARAGRAPH 65 – As previously stated the explanation, exposition, and publication of “state-sponsored child kidnapping and trafficking” that included the plaintiffs is 100% accurate. There is no debate about whether or not what I have published is true. The only issue is whether or not the plaintiffs like the fact that I am publishing it. They obviously do not, and that is why they have initiated this SLAPP suit.

46. PARAGRAPH 66 – Defamation occurs when someone makes a **false statement** of fact to a third party and causes another harm as a result. In order for me to have defamed any of the plaintiffs, I would have had to make a knowingly false statement with malice for the purpose of intentionally harming the plaintiffs. True statements, or statements of

opinion (things that I believe to be true), are not defamatory and cannot be litigated against. This entire case is therefore frivolous because everything I have stated is either 100% true and accurate or it is an opinion that I believe to be true. Furthermore Idaho State Statute 18-4801. States clearly, *“LIBEL DEFINED. A libel is a malicious defamation, expressed either by writing, printing, or by signs or pictures, or the like, tending to blacken the memory of one who is dead, or to impeach the honesty, integrity, virtue or reputation, or publish the natural or alleged defects, of one who is alive, and thereby to expose him to public hatred, contempt or ridicule.”* In my case, there was no “malicious defamation” at any point of time. I simply published things that are factually true and/or things that I believe to be factually true (my opinions). Additionally, St. Luke’s hospital and its employees are pseudo public figures seeing as though a very large portion of their revenue comes from government payments. Also, Idaho State Statute 18-4804 clearly states that malice is only presumed if *“An injurious publication is presumed to have been malicious if no justifiable motive for making it is shown.”* Well, it is very obvious that there are at least two very justifiable motives for exposing state subsidized child trafficking in Idaho (and nationwide). First, it was to see to it that Baby Cyrus was returned to his parent’s custody before further harm or death come to him. And second it was to expose the wickedness of the state subsidized child trafficking “ring” which I now believe to be a personal call from God—a duty far superseding any force or compulsion the government would try to tyrannize me with.

47. PARAGRAPH 67 – I never told anyone to “dox” anyone at any time. Furthermore, even if I did, “doxing” is not illegal nor is it slanderous or defamatory. In fact, it is a

Constitutionally protected right to have free speech and to assemble (in the case of protests).

48. PARAGRAPH 68 – As has already been described and explained, there was no defamation nor any evidence thereof. On the contrary, everything I have published is 100% accurate and true, or it is my opinion that I believe to be 100% accurate and true. I have personally given the plaintiffs and their counsel the opportunity to prove that any statement I have ever made or published was false, and they have failed to produce a single shred of evidence demonstrating any false statements on my behalf. This lawsuit is therefore frivolous and unconscionable and should be dismissed at once, lest the plaintiffs and their counsel learn to believe that they can manipulate the court system and use it as a weapon for their own pleasure regardless of how many Constitutional rights, civil rights, and other rights they destroy in the process.

49. PARAGRAPH 69 – There were no “false claims,” and since the plaintiffs have failed to produce a single shred of evidence that a false claim was made, particularly and specifically when the vast majority of all claims I have made are easily substantiated with publicly available data, then all complaints to the contrary are null and void. Plaintiffs must stop making false assertions immediately.

50. PARAGRAPH 70 – I am not responsible for the fallout which comes after truthful information is published about someone or some entity. I understand that if I willfully spread a false statement with the intention of harming another, that I am responsible for the consequences as that is true defamation. However, if I publish true information about evil activities on the behalf of another party, the consequences of that publication rests on the shoulders of those who committed the evil deeds. If St. Luke’s loses business or

prestige because the public learns that they profit off of the illegal, immoral, and unconscionable government subsidized child trafficking system that kidnaps approximately 4 children per day in Idaho—then those consequences belong on St. Luke’s itself. If they don’t want to face those consequences, instead of suing private individuals for exposing them, **they should consider the option of simply not participating in government subsidized child trafficking any longer!**

51. PARAGRAPH 71 – This is an absolutely ridiculous statement. What I knew and believed to be true at the time, and which has only been confirmed and validated much more profoundly since that time is that there is no justice for families who have been victimized by the government subsidized child trafficking system. Not only are parents forced to jump through endless hoops, logistical obstacles, outrageous legal expenses, total disruption and destruction of their livelihood, and more—but many children are completely lost (yes, they actually disappear forever) by IDHW and Foster Care in general, and many others end up seriously abused or dead. Baby Cyrus’s condition as a baby who at the time of his kidnapping could only feed off of his mother’s breastmilk was particularly dangerous since he could easily have died from lack of nutrition or care in St. Luke’s custody and the hospital would have just blamed it on the parents—a technique that they have used for years in many other cases and which they used quite profitably during the COVID scam. Therefore, time was of the essence as Baby Cyrus’s life was literally at risk. So no, there was no legal process or option to “address the custody and welfare of the infant,” especially and particularly since the entire kidnapping was predicated on a false premise of “imminent danger” which has already been proven to be false.

52. PARAGRAPH 72 – This is a useless attempt to create a straw-man argument that would only work against an ignorant judge or jury and such arguments are only used by legal teams who have no respect for the intelligence of said judge(s) or juri(es). What we actually knew and know is that St. Luke’s was receiving compensation for maintaining Baby Cyrus in their unlawful custody. We knew and know that the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare is financially incentivized to kidnap as many children as possible being paid millions of dollars annually by the Federal Government to do so. We knew and know that Baby Cyrus was illegally kidnapped by Meridian Police who broke at least 8 laws when they kidnapped him and based the entire kidnapping off of the false lie of “imminent danger” which has already proven to be false (the 8 Idaho laws that were broken can be seen here: <https://www.freedomman.org/cyrus/laws-that-were-broken/>). We knew and know that Baby Cyrus was in physical danger and his life was threatened by being away from his mother’s love, care, nurture, and most importantly—her breastmilk, which was the only source of nutrition that Baby Cyrus had received up to the time he was kidnapped, and the only source of nutrition that he demonstrated he could maintain. What we knew and know is that St. Luke’s hospital has already killed other babies through incompetence as demonstrated by this article published by the Idaho Statesman <https://www.idahostatesman.com/news/local/article41570394.html> and also by the personal testimony of Ed Danti, a family friend, who had his 10 month old child killed through medical incompetence from the St. Luke’s staff (his testimony can be seen here <https://stlukesexposed.com/truth-about-st-lukes/how-st-lukes-killed-a-10-month-old-baby/>). What we knew and know is that this government subsidized child trafficking system is so deep rooted, pervasive, and profitable, and that the bad actors involved have

so much to lose by being exposed, that most previous attempts by whistleblowers, investigative journalists, and others end up in their own “mysterious deaths.” This includes well known and prominent Georgia Senator who was murdered in her own home after publishing the scathing report, “The Corrupt Business of Child Protective Services” and who simply published and declared many of the same things that I have published and declared. So yes, the issue is serious and yes, I knew and know that everything I said and published was true and that St. Luke’s would not want me to publish it. This very lawsuit, as frivolous and unconscionable as it is, simply serves to ratify, verify, and confirm what the public was already thinking and believing—that St. Luke’s hospital is in fact guilty of the very things we have said they are guilty of (namely being willful participants in a government subsidized child trafficking system), and that they should not be trusted.

53. PARAGRAPH 73 – We never once engaged in any “wrongful acts.” On the contrary, St. Luke’s and the other plaintiffs engaged in many unlawful acts. Primarily, “kidnapping,” which is defined by Idaho State Statute § 18-4501 as “*KIDNAPING DEFINED. Every person who willfully... Leads, takes, entices away or detains a child under the age of sixteen (16) years, with intent to keep or conceal it from its custodial parent, guardian or other person having lawful care or control thereof, or with intent to steal any article upon the person of the child...*” By this legal definition, St. Luke’s and all other parties involved in Baby Cyrus’s kidnapping committed the illegal acts of legally defined “kidnapping” since they “*detained a child under the age of 16 years with the intent to keep...it from its custodial parent...[or] to obtain money, property or reward or any other thing of value for the return or disposition of such person is guilty of kidnaping*

[sic].” Since Baby Cyrus was illegally taken from his parent’s custody, and St. Luke’s Hospital was fully aware that his forceful kidnapping was illegal since it was their own doctor who pronounced that Baby Cyrus was not in “imminent danger” and that he was a “healthy baby” who had “no acute life threats,” and since St. Luke’s did not allow Baby Cyrus’s parents to be with him continuously, but rather kept him in their own custody racking up a bill and earning compensation from the government for at least \$34,000 (and likely much more), then this is the exact definition of kidnapping according to Idaho law, and St. Luke’s is guilty of it. They are the ones who committed “wrongful acts.”

54. PARAGRAPH 74 – This false claim has already been refuted above, but for sake of clarity, the only goal I had in publishing the truth about the plaintiffs was to 1) see to Baby Cyrus’s safe return as quickly as possible and 2) to ensure that the public was aware of the evil of government subsidized child trafficking that we uncovered (but were previously unaware of).

55. PARAGRAPH 75 – Again, everything I stated in this regard was factually accurate. Baby Cyrus was reviewed by the doctor onsite at St. Luke’s hospital when he was kidnapped and the doctor said that Baby Cyrus was a “healthy baby” and that “no acute life threats” were noted. Likewise, the parents only missed that one single medical appointment (which is not a justifiable reason for medical kidnap anyway), and we have the medical report which plainly declares that Dr. Natasha Erickson is the one who made a referral to CPS. So this paragraph is just “lie after lie after lie” demonstrating again the frivolous nature of this lawsuit.

56. PARAGRAPH 76 – This is the third time in this complaint that the plaintiffs have alleged that Dr. Natasha Erickson never contacted DHW regarding the infant. However, the

medical records show this to be false as anyone can see in the screenshot below:

St Luke's

Anderson, Cyrus James
MRN: 4289116, DOB: 5/1/2021, Sex: M
Acct #: 455708612
Adm: 3/12/2022, Adm: 3/12/2022, D/C: 3/15/2022

03/12/2022 - ED to Hosp-Admission (Discharged) in Boise Pediatrics (continued)

All Encounter Notes (group 1 of 3) (continued)

Progress Notes by Brianne E. Breese, LMSW at 3/12/2022 1730

Social Work Brief Note:

Situation: Cyrus Anderson is a 10 m.o. male who was admitted for failure to thrive. Social work consult from Natasha D. Erickson, MD for failure to thrive, ward of the state.

03/12/22 1751	
Referral Data	
Referral Source	Provider
Referral Name	Natasha D. Erickson, MD
Reason for Consult	Other (Comment) (failure to thrive, ward of the state)

Additionally, Dr. Erickson threatened to call CPS for Levi and Marissa wanting to leave the hospital without her consent (a threat called “AMA – against medical advice”) which has already been admitted by the plaintiffs in paragraph 32 of the complaint. And the day after Dr. Natasha Erickson made this threat, Marissa was visited in the hospital by a social worker from CPS.

57. PARAGRAPH 90 – I was not a paid marketing consultant for the Bundy Campaign. On the contrary, I did not earn a single dime of profit for any support I gave the Bundy for Governor campaign. It is against my personal belief system to profit off of political campaigns. You can feel free to ask any other elected official in Idaho’s current government including but not limited to Congressman Russ Fulcher, Attorney General Raul Labrador, State Representative Jason Monks, former Secretary of State Lawrence Denney—all of whom I supported and helped their campaigns—how much money I charged them for my “marketing support” or help. I cannot and will not profit off of

political activism as it is against my personal convictions to do so. I believe in having a righteous government system and such a system can only be maintained if financial incentives are not held by the individuals involved in the process. Therefore, I support the individual candidates I believe in, and I refuse to earn any profit from the process.

58. PARAGRAPH 93 –

- a. *“St Luke’s parties were participating in a conspiracy to kidnap, traffic, sexually abuse, and kill children.”* This statement is mostly true, though it conflates, confuses, and mixes many different elements of the truth and what has been published. It is true that St. Luke’s hospital does participate in government subsidized child trafficking, and they likewise profit off of it. However, I have never stated that St. Luke’s sexually abuses any children, though I have stated (because it is true), that many children who are taken by the government subsidized child trafficking system and placed into foster care do end up being sexually abused, and the Foster Care system nationwide admits this to be true. Additionally, I have claimed that children are killed while in St. Luke’s care, a fact that has already been substantiated in this response above.
- b. *“St. Luke’s parties were running a child trafficking ring in order to profit from tax dollars.”* No, St. Luke’s is not **running** a child trafficking ring, rather, they are **participating** in the government subsidized child trafficking ring that is run in Idaho by the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare.
- c. *“St. Luke’s parties were abusing and harming the Infant in irreparable ways.”* They did harm Baby Cyrus in irreparable ways. That is my subjective opinion, and I stand by it to this day. Additionally, the family and I are in agreement in

our belief that Baby Cyrus's C-DIFF infection was contracted at St. Luke's hospital as he did not have the infection previous to his kidnapping, and there is no other likely place for him to have contracted this infection.

- d. *"St. Luke's parties harmed and killed babies all the time."* St. Luke's has harmed and killed babies. I have already given two specific examples above and this does not include the number of children who were killed on ventilators during the COVID scams, through vaccine injuries that were forced on children through intimidation and fear, or any other illegitimate means to which the hospital knows it should not be doing. John Hopkins University published a study declaring death from doctors in allopathic hospitals (including St. Luke's) to be the 3rd leading cause of death in America, and being statistically responsible for 250,000 to 400,000 deaths every year (<https://www.cnbc.com/2018/02/22/medical-errors-third-leading-cause-of-death-in-america.html>). Only God knows how many of those deaths are minors at St. Luke's hospital but the evidence is clear that St. Luke's hospital does kill children, whether on accident or on purpose is not relevant to this case since Baby Cyrus was held in St. Luke's possession against the family's will.
- e. *"St. Luke's parties kidnapped the infant and other children."* No, St. Luke's was a willful participant in Baby Cyrus's kidnapping seeing as though they were the ones who received Baby Cyrus and kept them in their custody after he was forcefully and illegally kidnapped by Meridian police officers.
- f. *"St. Luke's parties were 'moronic imbeciles' who neglected the Infant."* I wholeheartedly believe this to this day. St. Luke's did not demonstrate a shred of

competence, medically or ethically, in their treatment of Baby Cyrus after he was kidnapped. Baby Cyrus has Cyclical Vomiting Syndrome, and they didn't even properly clean off his face when he vomited causing burn marks to appear on his face as has been shown to the public in pictures taken of baby Cyrus after his parent's first visit with him. Only incompetent and moronic imbeciles would leave a baby ALONE who has Cyclical Vomiting Syndrome and allow him to wallow in his own vomit. That is exactly how St. Luke's treated Baby Cyrus.

- g. *"St. Luke's parties stole the Infant."* Technically, it was Meridian Police who "stole" baby Cyrus, but if someone robbed a bank you only knowingly received the stolen money after another robbed the bank, aren't you still guilty of being an accomplice in the crime? Of course you are! Likewise, St. Luke's is guilty of being the knowing accomplice to Baby Cyrus's kidnapping.
- h. *"St. Luke's changed the infant into someone who was unrecognizable, lethargic, and unresponsive."* This is 100% factually accurate, and these are the very words of Baby Cyrus's own mother. And how would St. Luke's know otherwise? Did they raise him for 10 months prior to his kidnap? Do they have a point of reference to know how Baby Cyrus acted before his kidnap? Only the family, particularly Baby Cyrus's parents, would be qualified to make such a conclusion, not St. Luke's hospital or its staff. And this is the quote from Baby Cyrus's own mother which is one I stand by to this day.
- i. *"St. Luke's failed to keep the infant clean."* This is a fact that is substantiated by both medical records and pictures which have already been published.

- j. *“St. Luke’s caused the Infant ‘suspicious’ bruising.”* This is also true and the pictures of his bruises have already been published.
- k. *“St. Luke’s lied about the Infant’s treatment.”* We definitely still believe this to be true as the doctors were not forthcoming with their treatment, and we didn’t get the unredacted medical records back until January of 2023, nearly 9 months later. That is a significant amount of time to pass which would enable many changes to be made in the medical records and history. And the way that the staff handled the records that Levi (Baby Cyrus’s father) received early on in the process gave the family reason to believe that the records were tampered with since they would not simply print out the records and hand it to Levi—rather, they made him wait and wait until their lawyer had to call and threaten legal action against St. Luke’s for not providing the records.
- l. *“St. Luke’s parties vaccinated the Infant against the family’s wishes.”* I never said that. Though I did question whether they vaccinated Baby Cyrus as he had 4 pricks in his body that are consistent with needle pricks, and were not on Baby Cyrus’s body before he was kidnapped.
- m. *“St. Luke’s parties were ‘medically negligent.’”* I wholeheartedly believe this to be true. On many occasions this was demonstrated to our family. Some examples are (but not limited to): Dr. Natasha Erickson refusing to listen to the parents regarding the medical history of Baby Cyrus, Dr. Natasha Erickson refusing to let Baby Cyrus have an enema when he clearly needed one, St. Luke’s allowing Baby Cyrus to wallow in his own vomit, Nurse Tracy Jungmann forcing an exposed nasal tube back into Baby Cyrus’s nose and stomach without sanitizing it

or replacing it, and Baby Cyrus more-than-likely contracting a C-DIFF infection from St. Luke's hospital.

- n. *"St. Luke's was 'world famous' for 'mistreating people,' 'killing people,' and 'stealing babies from their parents.'"* St. Luke's has certainly earned a reputation for mistreating people as can easily be seen by how they treated their own employees who refused to get the COVID vaccine. Also, anecdotal stories regarding horrible treatment from St. Luke's can easily be acquired by simply asking people to tell you their stories in online forums, social media, or the like. St. Luke's has a horrible reputation which was only exacerbated by their tyrannical actions taken during COVID which certainly included killing many people on ventilators when the public knew that the ventilator protocols they were using would definitely kill the people who were on them. And as has previously been established, while St Luke's hospital does not personally engage in the kidnap of children, they do participate in the process making them an accessory to the crime of kidnap.
- o. *"St. Luke's forced the Infant to take 'toxic poison' which was then allowed to stay in the infant's body for days."* This is in reference to the barium contrast that St. Luke's made Baby Cyrus take which the CDC has already recognized as being a toxic substance (<https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm5243a5.htm>) and which caused Baby Cyrus harm and discomfort as noted by Baby Cyrus's parents.

- p. *“St. Luke’s parties changed and falsified information in the medical records to protect themselves.”* I still believe this to be true for the reasons stated above in sub-paragraph K.
- q. *“Mr. Roth was guilty of criminal accessory of child abduction and deprivation of rights under color of law.”* I do not remember saying this, nor do I believe that I said it. However, I do agree that St. Luke’s hospital is a criminal accessory to kidnapping as defined by Idaho State Statute § 18-4501 and explained in section 54 above in this response.
- r. *“Mr. Roth personally profited from the pandemic.”* I believe this to be true by simply comparing the income of Mr. Roth before the pandemic to his income after St. Luke’s had received “COVID monies” from the federal government (and comparing said income with other executive staff members before Mr. Roth), one can conclude easily that Mr. Roth did, in fact, profit and benefit personally from the pandemic.
- s. *“Dr. Erickson was responsible for the Infant’s kidnapping.”* Dr. Erickson was the one who first initiated contact with CPS as already noted in section 57 above. For that reason, one can conclude that she bears a measure of responsibility for the entire scenario since she used her position as a doctor and someone who CPS responds to as a weapon to get her way, in evident total disregard for the actual safety and wellbeing of Baby Cyrus.
- t. *“Dr. Erickson participated in kidnapping ‘hundreds of children’ with the help of a judge.”* I definitely believe this to be true, though it could be “thousands” and not “hundreds.” If this case is not rightfully dismissed as being a frivolous

lawsuit, then discovery on this case will demonstrate just how many children have been referred to CPS by Dr. Natasha Erickson and just how much money St. Luke's hospital has received for having these children in their custody after they were kidnapped. And not just Dr. Natasha Erickson, but ALL of St. Luke's doctors and staff—we will find out how the staff of an organization who receives compensation for having kidnapped babies in its custody regularly and inappropriately uses this power to be financially rewarded. This type of setup, by the way, in any other industry would be considered a “conflict of interest” and would not be allowed. And in some industries, this type of conflict of interest where “authorities” are financially incentivized to make false or otherwise unethical claims or to give advice that they receive compensation for, is a punishable criminal offense.

- u. *“The infant ‘possibly could lose his life because of the decisions of people [at St. Luke’s] who don’t even care about the infant.’”* This is demonstrably true as I have already shown above that other infants in St. Luke's custody have, in fact, lost their lives due to St. Luke's decisions and incompetence.
- v. *“The hospital made the Infant ‘more sickly.’”* This is also true and has already been demonstrated by pictures of Baby Cyrus after he was returned to his parents, and by the testimony of his parents who know better than anybody about the condition of their own child.
- w. *“Followers should put ‘physical pressure’ on those ‘that are causing the problem.’”* I never said this.

- x. *“Followers should disrupt St. Luke’s operations by protesting, calling in, donating money, making noise, and giving the hospital ‘hell.’”* There is not a single one of those things that are illegal or malicious. What is malicious is kidnapping a baby from his parents and endangering that child by keeping him away from his only source of nutrition (his mother’s breastmilk), and doing so because you are financially compensated by the government. That is evil, wicked, and illegal.
- y. *“God should crush the necks of those that are evil.”* I certainly do not remember saying this, nor is it in line with something that I would typically say since it is not an actual Bible scripture or a biblical quotation, which I would generally use. However, I am happy to claim it since I do agree that “God should crush the necks of those that are evil.” If someone does not want to face God’s wrath, they simply should not be evil. And if someone wants forgiveness, they can simply repent of their sins and wicked deeds. And in the case of St. Luke’s and the bad actors who were responsible for Baby Cyrus’s kidnapping, even my family is prepared to forgive all of those involved in his vicious, vile, violent, and unconscionable kidnapping.

59. PARAGRAPH 94 – If there was a disruption to St Luke’s operations that is St. Luke’s fault for participating in child trafficking. They bear the sole responsibility for the consequences of their actions.

60. PARAGRAPH 96 – There was not a single defamatory remark made at my press conferences in front of the hospital, and the plaintiffs have failed to provide any evidence of one. Again, this only demonstrates the frivolous nature of this unconscionable lawsuit.

61. PARAGRAPH 97 – I am not aware of anybody harassing patients or staff, and I certainly never incited anybody to do so. In fact, I would be completely opposed to such harassment if it ever occurred. But again, St. Luke’s is responsible for the consequences of their own actions, and let’s consider the “anxiety and fear” that they have caused over the years for all of the families they have threatened with CPS, or who have had their children kidnapped by CPS because of St. Luke’s inappropriate referrals, or of all of the employees of St. Luke’s who were fired and lost their livelihoods for not taking the COVID vaccine, or of all the families whose loved ones were killed by ventilators that St. Luke’s put them on, or of the total fear and anxiety of the confused minors whose genitals are mutilated by St. Luke’s hospital in disgusting sex change operations that are performed there (being one of only 13 hospitals in the country that we know about who performs such disgusting genital mutilation processes).

62. PARAGRAPH 98 – This is a completely erroneous allegation. I, nor Ammon, nor anybody can “go so far as to cause St. Luke’s to go into lockdown.” That is a decision that St. Luke’s itself would have to make and it is one that we know they made in order to garner public support in their favor—since we had learned from many whistleblowers on the inside of St. Luke’s and from the general sentiment of the public at large, that St. Luke’s had already lost respect and support both in public and internally with their own employees. St. Luke’s therefore had to create a “false flag” in order to turn public support back in their favor and therefore they created this false idea that there was some sort of threat that caused the hospital to go into lockdown. When this “lockdown” took place, we understood immediately that St. Luke’s was trying to create this false narrative in order to garner public support, so we had some people go around at that very moment

to film the protestors and to capture the exact scene outside of St. Luke's hospital at the moment they claimed they were under threat. This video can be seen as video #4 on this page <https://www.freedomman.org/cyrus/videos/>, and it clearly shows that St. Luke's is simply lying. The video shows mothers with strollers, grandparents, and genuinely peaceful protestors with signs on public sidewalks, who neither posed a threat, nor set foot on St. Luke's private property. St. Luke's has simply demonstrated their own wickedness once again!

63. PARAGRAPH 100 – it would be impossible to ascertain the level of financial ruin that parents and families experience after having their children illegally kidnapped. And most American citizens with decency automatically recognize this level of devastation and want to help with financial support. To this end, a GiveSendGo campaign was setup to help Marissa and Levi, and people voluntarily and graciously donated to their cause.
64. PARAGRAPH 102 – there was not a single defamatory remark ever made and the plaintiffs have still failed to produce any evidence of a single defamatory remark.
65. PARAGRAPH 103 – Solicitations for donations were made on the premise of people wanting to help with legal expenses and the family's expenses and never did I claim that the donations were going to pay St. Luke's medical bills! On the contrary, we would never ask people to donate money to pay off an entity who was an accessory to Baby Cyrus's kidnap in the first place! However, I do believe wholeheartedly, and there is sufficient evidence to build the case that allopathic hospitals like St. Luke's structure all of their protocols specifically to maximize their own profitability and not to ensure their patients' health.

66. PARAGRAPH 104 – This paragraph is a tacit admission on behalf of St. Luke’s that they do, in fact, receive compensation from the Federal Government for having Baby Cyrus in their custody. Once in their custody, they knew they could perform any treatment, test, or “service” on him that they chose, and that it would all be paid for by the government. They knew this “free money” was available to them, and they admit it right here in paragraph 104!

67. PARAGRAPH 105 – These statements are in direct contradiction with the testimony of the parents themselves. Levi and Marissa were not made aware that their costs were being covered by government assistance and would not have wanted such assistance if they were made aware of it. It is evident that the only one who wanted this government assistance was St. Luke’s so they could use Baby Cyrus like a debit card, simply scanning his barcode (they literally put a barcode on his wrist), and ordering up every test, service, or “treatment” available so that they could financially profit off of Baby Cyrus with “free money” from the government.

68. PARAGRAPH 106 – Levi and Marissa are an honest, hard working family and did not want any assistance from the government so it is irrelevant that a patient financial advocate tried to get them to sign up for Medicaid. It only demonstrates that St. Luke’s true concern was making money off of Baby Cyrus.

69. PARAGRAPH 107 – Marissa and Levi never applied for Medicaid meaning that St. Luke’s or some agency connected to St. Luke’s made this application without parental consent and did so in order to financially profit off of Baby Cyrus.

70. PARAGRAPH 108 – The kidnapping of Baby Cyrus did absolutely create huge financial liabilities for the Anderson family. This is including but not limited to: loss of income

from inability to work, legal expenses, logistical expenses, new medical expenses (not from St. Luke's but from other providers who had to fix St. Luke's errors) and more.

71. PARAGRAPH 114 – I will never cease to publish and proclaim the reality and the wickedness of government subsidized child trafficking. It is real. It is going on every day in America. It happens nearly 4 times per day in Idaho. St. Luke's is profiting off of it as is the Idaho Department of health and Welfare. And it is my Constitutional right to be able to publish these facts to the world and I will do so, whether I am dead or alive, I will ensure that the publications go on.
72. PARAGRAPH 115 – The People Against Child Trafficking is also not a legal entity. It was simply the name we gave to a conference/seminar/meeting that we had to expose everything we had learned in the process of Baby Cyrus's kidnapping.
73. PARAGRAPH 118 – Every statement ("a" through "d") is accurate and I stand by them to this day.
74. PARAGRAPH 120 – As has already been demonstrated multiple times, no "defamatory speech" was used, and the plaintiffs have failed to provide a single shred of evidence to the contrary.
75. PARAGRAPH 126 – This is true and has already been explained repeatedly in this response.
76. PARAGRAPH 127 – Not only is it true that St. Luke's has profited off of the false kidnapping of Baby Cyrus, but they have admitted to it in their very complaint (by stating that they were paid by Medicaid for Cyrus), and new records demonstrate that they were compensated at least \$34,000 for having Baby Cyrus in their custody.

77. PARAGRAPH 128 – This must be in reference to the StLukesExposed.com website

which I have created where I do state that St. Luke's is corrupt and wicked because it is both demonstrably true and also my opinion, which I wholeheartedly believe and can support with evidence.

78. PARAGRAPH 138 – First of all there, is no legally defined concept of “hate speech” in the State of Idaho. Nevertheless, my statements regarding homosexuals or members of the so called “LGBTQ+” community are not based in hate or malice, rather they are factual statements based on the Bible. It is apparent that counsel for the plaintiffs is personally offended by such speech, most likely because he is member of that community.

79. PARAGRAPH 139 – The evidence shows that the government subsidized child trafficking ring, while historically have focused on preying on the poor and “minorities,” have made a significant shift toward preying on people of faith—particularly and specifically on people of faith who reject government propaganda and dogma and who choose to homeschool their children, reject vaccinations, and reject homosexuality. It is also a statistical fact that there is a disproportionate number of atheists, homosexuals, transvestites, and other communities of people who are hostile to Christianity who work at the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare and who have unchecked power over the lives of Christian people, up to and including the ability to illegally and immorally kidnap their children.

80. PARAGRAPH 141 (RESPONSE TO COUNT I) – The plaintiffs have failed to provide a shred of evidence that any statement or verbal pronouncement that I have made regarding

them was false. Therefore this entire lawsuit is a sham, and it is frivolous and unconscionable.

- a. This is true and I already responded to it above. Furthermore, plaintiffs have failed to provide any evidence that these statements were false or that I knew they were false and knowingly stated them in order to harm them.
- b. This is true and I already responded to it above.
- c. This is true and I already responded to it above.
- d. *“Defendants falsely and publicly accused Plaintiffs of kidnapping children.”* As clarified above, I have accurately and publicly accused Plaintiffs of participating in child kidnap as defined by Idaho State Statute.
- e. There were no threats to Plaintiffs that I caused. If someone else threatened or harassed St. Luke’s, then you can sue them for harassment.
- f. I was not involved in the publication of these fliers, but I do support it.
- g. Everything stated on the Freedom Man Press website is accurate. Furthermore, plaintiffs have failed to provide any evidence that these statements were false or that I knew they were false and knowingly stated them in order to harm them.
- h. It is true that Dr. Natasha Erickson reacted negatively to Marissa and Levi choosing not to vaccinate Baby Cyrus, and likewise, it is also true that the day after she threatened to call CPS for not obeying her, a social worker from CPS did visit Marissa in the hospital to interview her.
- i. I do believe and am still of the opinion that Dr. Erickson is incompetent at her profession for the reasons already stated above in this response.
- j. I have already provided proof that St. Luke’s does kill babies.

- k. This is a statement from Ammon, not me, but I believe that Ammon is correct in his assertion.
- l. These statements are conflated and confused. But, it is true that Nurse Jungmann does receive compensation from St Luke's hospital, who likewise receives compensation from child kidnapping as has already been demonstrated. It is also true that at the so-called CARES unit where Nurse Jungmann works, these nurses commonly inspect the genitals of little children who are complete strangers.
- m. Nurse Jungmann never once reviewed, viewed, or diagnosed Baby Cyrus in person. Yet, she gave the diagnosis of "imminent danger" to the Meridian Police which was the claim necessary to give the police cover in order to kidnap Baby Cyrus. This diagnosis was demonstrably false, and it is definitely inappropriate and what I could consider "medical malpractice" to make a life-altering medical diagnosis over the phone, through a third party, without ever having looked at a patient in person.
- n. St. Luke's was involved in the kidnapping of Baby Cyrus for profit and that has already been demonstrated with evidence in the public domain and by St. Luke's own admission in this very complaint.
- o. I do believe St. Luke's, along with all other allopathic hospitals in the country, are connected to what can only be described as a "medical mafia." It consists of Big Pharma companies like Pfizer and others, and it is responsible for being the 3rd highest cause of deaths in America.
- p. This was stated by Ammon, not me, but I do believe Ammon was correct in his assertion.

- q. This allegedly was stated by Ammon, not me, but I don't believe he actually made this statement.
 - r. This was stated by Ammon, not me, but I do believe Ammon was correct in his assertion.
 - s. This was stated by Ammon, not me, but I do believe Ammon was correct in his assertion.
 - t. This was stated by Ammon, not me, but I do believe Ammon was correct in his assertion.
 - u. This is true and I already responded to it above. Furthermore, plaintiffs have failed to provide any evidence that these statements were false or that I knew they were false and knowingly stated them in order to harm them.
81. PARAGRAPH 142 – These statements were all true or I believe them to be true, as explained above.
82. PARAGRAPH 143 – Both at the time that I made these statements and still to this day, I know these statements to be true, and I can substantiate them all with evidence, which have already been published in the public domain and can be seen at the website FreedomMan.org/cyrus.
83. PARAGRAPH 145 – I made all of the published statements with the intent to expose the truth.
84. PARAGRAPH 146 – Not only is this not true as an accusation, but it's also not true as a matter of fact since no defendant in this case has earned a single penny of financial gain from this process; rather, on the contrary, we have all suffered financially as a result.

85. PARAGRAPH 147 – The statements are all factually accurate so they are not defamatory at all, neither *per se* nor *per quod*.
86. PARAGRAPH 149 – I cannot be held responsible for what others may or may not do in response to the publication of factually accurate information.
87. PARAGRAPH 150 – I have never used any hate speech, which is a term that does not exist or have any legal definition, but if any member of the so-called “LGBTQ+” community is offended by me mentioning Biblical truths in regards to their sin, the proper response is not to whine, complain, moan, or sue, but rather to repent and serve Jesus Christ.
88. PARAGRAPH 152 – Plaintiffs are knowingly, intentionally, willfully, and maliciously making false allegations against me. I have not made a single false statement about them, I have proven it by publishing the evidence to substantiate my claims, and have given them the opportunity to share their evidence and earn a public apology and retraction(s) from me; yet they have failed to provide a single solitary shred of evidence—only demonstrating again that this case is entirely frivolous and not based on any factual evidence whatsoever. The case should be dismissed immediately.
89. PARAGRAPH 154 – I have published no false information whatsoever.
90. PARAGRAPH 155 – No statements that I’ve made were false, nor did I ever knowingly state any false information.
91. PARAGRAPH 156 – Any exposure of truth that shed light on any of the plaintiffs in this case did not put them in a “false light” but in “true light.” I can’t help it if evil people and evil entities don’t like it when light is shined on their darkness. **John 3:19** “*And this*

is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.”

92. PARAGRAPH 157 – At the time I made the statements I have made I knew them to be true and accurate and still know them to be true and accurate.

93. PARAGRAPH 160 – Not a single act that I partook in was done with any malice nor was any of it false. However, because plaintiffs knowingly are lying about all of their allegations against me, they are weaponizing this very court to use as a tool to destroy me financially, and have even said so in private to others who have relayed the information to at least one Ada County Commissioner who has shared their statements with a member of my family, then this case should be rightfully noted as frivolous, heinous, unconscionable and shocking to the public conscience and to all humans with decency.

94. PARAGRAPH 162 – I have not acted in any extreme or outrageous conduct. How on earth could fighting through peaceful means to restore your grandson to his family after he was illegally kidnapped by force by people who were financially incentivized to kidnap him be considered “extreme or outrageous.” On the contrary, what is extreme and outrageous is for an entity or system to be financially incentivized to steal and kidnap children through violent methods, and to willfully participate in such a system while destroying the lives of innocent people. That is extreme and outrageous conduct and that goes way beyond the bounds of any decency in any civilized society. Kidnapping babies and getting paid for participating in such kidnapping is disgusting and outrageous. But peacefully protesting and publishing factual information is not extreme nor outrageous at all. In fact, it is common sense and reasonable. Furthermore, attempting to use the American justice system as a weapon to silence those who have exposed your wickedness

is so far beyond the pale, so outrageous and so extreme, that the public have already deemed it and judged it to be evil, wicked, and diabolical. Once again, the plaintiffs and their counsel are demonstrating textbook “projection,” where they are accusing me of doing exactly what they are doing.

95. PARAGRAPH 173 – The plaintiffs and their counsel simply can’t stop lying. There wasn’t any revenue generated for any defendant in this case, period.

96. PARAGRAPH 174 – I was never asked to leave St. Luke’s property at any point in time. Furthermore any and all protesting was done on public sidewalks and not on St. Luke’s property. Had I mistakenly been on St. Luke’s property and had they asked me to leave their property, I would have done so. They are simply intentionally distorting facts to create a false narrative.

97. PARAGRAPH 175 – I never once blocked access to the hospital or disrupted hospital operations with my physical presence outside of the hospital. This is a bald-faced lie and the plaintiffs know it, but evidently don’t have enough respect for the judge, the future jury, or the American justice system to tell the truth.

98. PARAGRAPH 185 – Any time spent near St. Luke’s property was for the proper purpose of protesting against the illegal kidnapping of my grandson.

99. PARAGRAPH 188 – Again, I was never asked to leave St. Luke’s property at any point in time. Furthermore, any and all protesting was done on public sidewalks and not on St. Luke’s property. Had I mistakenly been on St. Luke’s property and had they asked me to leave their property, I would have done so. They are simply intentionally distorting facts to create a false narrative.

100. PARAGRAPH 189 – Again, I never once blocked access to the hospital or disrupted hospital operations with my physical presence outside of the hospital. They are repeating the same lie as in paragraph 175.
101. PARAGRAPH 190 – My presence outside of St. Luke’s hospital did not interfere with St. Luke’s ability to provide any service to any other client. That is a complete lie.
102. PARAGRAPH 191 – This paragraph shows the corrupt and twisted nature of the plaintiffs complaint and false allegations. They are now asking for damages from “each defendant” even though they have previously claimed that the defendants are indistinguishable from Ammon and I. In my case, they are claiming Freedom Man PAC (which was a registered Political Action Committee in Idaho), Freedom Man Press, LLC (which does not exist as a legal entity and to which the plaintiffs admit does not exist), and Diego Rodriguez (the individual being myself) should each pay an amount no less than \$250,000. This is such an obvious “scam tactic” which is designed to triple the financial attack against me by forcing my actions to be placed on other entities which either don’t exist or were not involved. This is such a blatant abuse of the court system that it goes beyond the bounds of decency in a civilized society. If the court system was honest, true, and legitimate, this case would only have two defendants: Ammon Bundy and Diego Rodriguez. Previous to now, I assumed the addition of the additional entities, particularly two of them which don’t even exist (Peoples Rights Network and Freedom Man Press, LLC do not exist as legal entities) was simply another demonstration of incompetence on behalf of the plaintiff’s counsel. Now I see that it was part of the plan to triple the requested reward by forcing Ammon and I to pay triple for entities that don’t exist or were not a part of the lawsuit.

103. PARAGRAPH 193 – I have never once engaged in political activism for financial gain and would never do so as it is contrary to my personal beliefs and convictions. So this is another outright lie.
104. PARAGRAPH 195 – I have never once used the story of Baby Cyrus to advertise for Power Marketing. That is a bald-faced lie, and there is not a shred of evidence that I have ever done so. The plaintiffs and their counsel have told so many outright lies that it is completely outrageous and no rational nor decent human being could imagine doing so.
105. PARAGRAPH 196 – This assertion again shows the incompetence of plaintiff’s counsel in claiming that “FMP” which is “Freedom Man Press” “owns and operates FreedomMan.org.” First of all, in paragraph 18, the plaintiffs already admit that they have searched for “Freedom Man Press, LLC” and have determined that it does not exist as it is “not registered as an LLC in Idaho or registered to do business in Idaho.” That is because the entity “Freedom Man Press, LLC” does not exist and I have already testified, under oath, to this fact in a deposition with the plaintiff’s counsel present and asking the questions. Furthermore, I have never earned a dime directly or indirectly for the existence of FreedomMan.org, which is my personal blog that I personally control and own, and I never will use it as a vehicle to generate revenue as I see it as a personal mission and call from God to use this website/platform as a tool to proclaim truth and expose corruption. Once again, the plaintiffs are making false allegations without any evidence or knowledge of the facts.
106. PARAGRAPHS 201 & 202 – The plaintiff again is engaging in more “throwing mud at the wall in the hope that some of it will stick.” There is nothing in Idaho Code § 48-603C that even remotely pertains to this case. The statute plainly states, “48-603C.

UNCONSCIONABLE METHODS, ACTS OR PRACTICES. (1) Any unconscionable method, act or practice in the conduct of any trade or commerce violates the provisions of this chapter whether it occurs before, during, or after the conduct of the trade or commerce. (2) In determining whether a method, act or practice is unconscionable, the following circumstances shall be taken into consideration by the court: (a) Whether the alleged violator knowingly or with reason to know, took advantage of a consumer reasonably unable to protect his interest because of physical infirmity, ignorance, illiteracy, inability to understand the language of the agreement or similar factor; (b) Whether, at the time the consumer transaction was entered into, the alleged violator knew or had reason to know that the price grossly exceeded the price at which similar goods or services were readily available in similar transactions by similar persons, although price alone is insufficient to prove an unconscionable method, act or practice; (c) Whether the alleged violator knowingly or with reason to know, induced the consumer to enter into a transaction that was excessively one-sided in favor of the alleged violator; (d) Whether the sales conduct or pattern of sales conduct would outrage or offend the public conscience, as determined by the court.” Nothing in this law pertains to the Baby Cyrus case or any of the facts alleged in this case as we have not sold any product or service to any citizen of Idaho. As has already been demonstrated, the only unconscionable acts that have taken place in the context of this case are the acts performed by the plaintiffs in participating in the kidnap of my grandson and subsequently filing this frivolous lawsuit which is a textbook example of a “SLAPP” suit against those of us who they harmed.

107. PARAGRAPH 203 – Again, there is not a single shred of evidence that actions or proclamations that I have made are misleading false or deceptive. On the contrary, this entire lawsuit is misleading, false, and deceptive—while all the statements I have made are factually accurate, true, and provable with evidence already published and available in the public domain.
108. PARAGRAPH 204 – Our conduct and pattern of conduct are not outrageous and offensive to the public conscience, on the contrary, *kidnapping children and being paid to participate in it is outrageous and offensive to the public conscience.*
109. PARAGRAPH 208 – The plaintiffs are falsely asserting that donations were solicited on behalf of Baby Cyrus’s parents so they could pay medical bills owed to SLHS and SLRMC. This is a flat out lie, and we never solicited donations for this purpose as I have already stated above in this response. Nevertheless, this paragraph 208, again demonstrates that St. Luke’s hospital admits to receiving compensation from “government programs” for whatever they claimed to have done to Baby Cyrus.
110. PARAGRAPH 209 – This is another outright lie. I never used any unfair, false, deceptive, misleading, or unconscionable acts and practices. On the contrary, people of good conscience and faith all around the world willfully and happily made donations on their own free accord because they saw the acts of St. Luke’s hospital, the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, the Meridian Police department and all other bad actors pertaining to Baby Cyrus’s kidnapping as being unconscionable acts and practices!
111. PARAGRAPH 210 – As already noted, we never falsely represented the amount of liability incurred relating to medical expenses associated with treating Baby Cyrus. The plaintiffs are again just engaging in willful and malicious lying. And I can assure you

that the Anderson family would never have given any money to St. Luke's hospital after they participated in his kidnap. You don't reward accomplices to kidnapping with compensation!

112. PARAGRAPH 215 – Again, it was St. Luke's hospital and the plaintiffs who engaged in unconscionable acts and methods, not me.
113. PARAGRAPH 216 – Nothing I ever stated was misleading, false, or deceptive, but it was all true or something I believed and still believe to be true.
114. PARAGRAPH 217 – No, kidnapping children for profit is outrageous and offensive to the public conscience.
115. PARAGRAPH 218 – How do you “donate wrongfully?” Decent and godly people all around the country donated on their own freewill and free accord after watching video evidence and reading and seeing evidence with their own eyes how Baby Cyrus was illegally, immorally, and unconscionably kidnapped. Not a single donor has complained about their donation being used to help the Anderson family. On the contrary, everyone is grateful and thankful to have been a part of restoring Baby Cyrus to his family.
116. PARAGRAPH 220 – The only ones who have misled the public are the bad actors who were responsible for the kidnapping of Baby Cyrus. And this includes all of the false allegations made by the plaintiffs in this very lawsuit.
117. PARAGRAPHS 222 – 227 – Not a single word that I have spoken relating to the Baby Cyrus case or story was false, misleading, or deceptive. This lawsuit is frivolous as has been demonstrated in this response on multiple occasions. Not a single allegation has been substantiated with evidence, and the plaintiffs have rejected my public offer to retract any false claims I have made and offer retractions to each plaintiff individually if

they could simply demonstrate or produce any evidence that any claim I have made was false and that I knowingly proclaimed and spread false information. Their failure to provide any evidence only demonstrates that they know the entire case is a fraud, and they are hoping that they can mislead the public with this frivolous SLAPP suit and intimidate any other whistleblowers from exposing their wickedness, corruption, and unconscionable acts of evil.

CERTIFICATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY

I certify under penalty of perjury pursuant to the law of the State of Idaho that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date: MARCH 15, 2023

DIEGO RODRIGUEZ

Typed/printed

DIEGO RODRIGUEZ

Signature

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify I served a copy to: (name all parties or their attorneys in the case, other than yourself)

Erik F. Stidham (ISB #5483)
HOLLAND & HART LLP
800 W. Main Street, Suite 1750
Boise, ID 83702-5974

☐ By Mail

☐ By fax

☒ By Email/iCourt/eServe:
efstidham@hollandhart.com

Date: MARCH 15, 2023

DIEGO RODRIGUEZ
Signature

DIEGO RODRIGUEZ
Typed/printed Name of Party Signing